

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Costigan	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.
Bankhead	Cutting	Jones	Robinson, Ind.
Barbour	Dickinson	Kendrick	Schall
Barkley	Dill	King	Sheppard
Bingham	Fess	La Follette	Shortridge
Blaine	Fletcher	Logan	Smith
Bratton	Frazier	McKellar	Smoot
Bulkeley	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Glass	Metcalf	Townsend
Byrns	Gore	Moses	Vandenberg
Capper	Hale	Norbeck	Wagner
Caraway	Hastings	Norris	Wheeler
Cohen	Hawes	Nye	White
Connally	Howell	Oddie	
Coolidge	Hull	Patterson	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GLASS addressed the Senate in support of the bill. After having spoken with interruptions for more than two hours he yielded the floor for the day. His speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Virginia is very tired and wishes to suspend his remarks. I do not know whether anyone else is prepared to proceed at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have canvassed the situation and find that no Senator is prepared to proceed with the discussion of the measure at this time. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] does not wish to proceed until to-morrow. Under the circumstances I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9, 1932

SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE

Orsen N. Nielsen, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a consul, to be also a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

Maj. William C. Powers, jr., to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of May, 1932.

First Lieut. Clinton W. McLeod to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of May, 1932.

Second Lieut. Con D. Silard to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April, 1932.

Second Lieut. Ward E. Dickey to be a first lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of May, 1932.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of Our Fathers, Thy merciful providences go far beyond our utmost expectations and our hopes. Thou dost bestow them not according to our merits or prayers but because of Thy holy, compassionate nature. Strengthen us to-day with the actual, transforming faith in Thee. Thou and Thou alone art the most precious source of vision and energy. One touch of Thy Spirit, one flash from Thy throne will reveal unto us the way and bring to our tasks a clearness and a certitude which will enable us to grip the truths by which we must work and live. Thus with Thy presence and with confidence may we approach our labors. In Thee may we always find the index to character and the way to the highest attainments. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 29, 1932:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution to provide additional appropriations for contingent expenses of the House of Representatives for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932.

On May 2, 1932:

H. R. 231. An act to grant certain lands to the State of Colorado for the benefit of the Colorado School of Mines;

H. R. 9598. An act to authorize expenditures for the enforcement of the contract-labor provisions of the immigration law;

H. R. 8084. An act for the protection of the northern Pacific halibut fishery;

H. R. 5603. An act to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the State of Minnesota of lot 4, section 18, township 131 north, range 29 west, in the county of Morrison, Minn.;

H. R. 8914. An act to accept the grant by the State of Montana of concurrent police jurisdiction over the rights of way of the Blackfeet Highway, and over the rights of way of its connections with the Glacier National Park road system on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in the State of Montana;

H. R. 1768. An act for the relief of Alvina Hollis;

H. R. 3580. An act for the relief of Clara E. Wight; and

H. R. 4752. An act for establishment of the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park.

On May 3, 1932:

H. R. 7119. An act to authorize the modification of the boundary line between the Panama Canal and the Republic of Panama, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1231. An act for the relief of Grina Bros.

On May 4, 1932:

H. R. 5484. An act extending the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the sale of desert lands in certain States and Territories," approved March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), and acts amendatory thereof, to ceded lands of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation;

H. R. 1770. An act for the relief of Senelma Wirkkula, also known as Selma Wirkkula; Alice Marie Wirkkula; and Bernice Elaine Wirkkula; and

H. R. 10495. An act amending an act of Congress approved February 28, 1919 (40 Stat. L. 1206), granting the city of San Diego certain lands in the Cleveland National Forest and the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation for dam and reservoir purposes for the conservation of water, and for other purposes, so as to include additional lands.

On May 6, 1932:

H. R. 8083. An act providing for the appointment as ensigns in the line of the Navy of all midshipmen who graduate from the Naval Academy in 1932, and for other purposes.

MASONIC MUTUAL RELIEF ASSOCIATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7357) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1869, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this is not the unfinished business.

Mrs. NORTON. No.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, what bill is this?

Mr. WOODRUM. The Acacia bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there is to be an adjustment with respect to this matter, and I think we ought to go into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and I therefore object.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the military appropriation bill by showing in what manner certain officers of the Army would be affected by the proposed change.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the military appropriation bill, I have thought it proper and desirable that the House shall have an opportunity to know the names of the officers who would be retired by the passage of this bill, the State from which each comes, the source from which they entered the Army, and whether or not they had any former enlisted service in the Army.

I have, therefore, requested the War Department to prepare a correct list which will show the names of those to be retired by this act in each grade.

It must be remembered that four major generals and nine brigadier generals will be retired if this bill passes, but that instead of being retired for age alone those to be so retired may be selected by competent authority.

In every other instance in this list the selection for retirement will be made of the oldest officers in each grade without any discrimination as to their efficiency or as to whether or not they are more efficient and more desirable to be retained than those who are younger in years.

In this list certain abbreviations have been employed which have the following meanings:

MA—Military Academy.

Vol—Volunteers.

Em—Emergency.

Civ—Civil life.

The list so prepared by the War Department is as follows:

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
COLONELS				
1	Joyes, John W., Ord. D.	California	MA	No.
5	Burgess, Louis R., C. A. C.	Iowa	MA	No.
7	Butts, Edmund L., Inf.	Minnesota	MA	No.
8	Hoff, Samuel, Ord. D.	Wisconsin	MA	No.
11	Jarvis, Melville S., Inf.	West Virginia	MA	No.
13	Timberlake, Edward J., Q. M. C.	Tennessee	MA	No.
15	Fleming, Robert J., Cav.	Michigan	MA	No.
23	Winship, Blanton, J. A. G. D.	Georgia	Vol	No.
24	Kessler, Percy M., C. A. C.	Indiana	MA	No.
27	Conrad, Julius T., A. G. D.	District of Columbia	MA	No.
29	Rutherford, Samuel McP., Cav.	Pennsylvania	MA	No.
30	Woodward, John E., A. G. D.	Vermont	MA	No.
31	Weeks, George McD., Inf.	Arizona	MA	No.
32	Wolfe, Orrin R., Inf.	Kentucky	Army	No.
33	Smedberg, William R., jr., Cav.	California	MA	No.
37	Kilbourne, Lincoln F., Inf.	Ohio	MA	No.
38	Knudsen, Fredrik L., Inf.	Norway	Army	No.
39	Ladue, William B., C. E.	Oregon	MA	No.
40	Barden, William L., C. E.	Connecticut	MA	No.
41	O'Hern, Edward P., Ord. D.	New York	MA	No.
44	Vidmer, George, Cav.	Alabama	MA	No.
47	Wells, Frank L., Inf.	Indiana	MA	No.
48	Whitworth, Pegram, Inf.	Louisiana	MA	No.
51	Burgess, Harry, C. E.	Mississippi	MA	No.
52	Ames, Thales L., Ord. D.	Wisconsin	MA	No.
53	Cavenaugh, Harry LaT., Cav.	Oklahoma	MA	No.
57	Herron, Joseph S., F. A.	Ohio	MA	No.
58	Bash, Louis H., Q. M. C.	Illinois	MA	No.
59	Watson, Frank B., Inf.	New Jersey	MA	No.
60	Pearce, Thomas A., Inf.	Texas	MA	No.
61	Simonds, Lawrence B., Inf.	New York	Army	No.
62	Ryther, Dwight W., Inf.	do	Army	No.
64	Shaw, Frederick B., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Army	No.
65	Hoffman, George M., C. E.	do	MA	No.
66	Stodter, Charles E., Cav.	Ohio	MA	No.
69	Bell, Ola W., Cav.	Michigan	MA	No.
77	Munson, Fred L., Inf.	Indian Territory	Army	No.
87	Roberts, Thos. A., Cav.	Illinois	MA	No.
120	Oury, William H., Inf.	Nebraska	Vol	No.
126	Ross, Tenney, Inf.	District of Columbia	Civ	No.
138	Hilton, Charles H., C. A. C.	At large, Colorado	Vol	No.
139	Byroade, George L., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Army	No.
226	Sturges, Edward L., F. D.	At large, Washington	Vol	No.
227	Luhn, William L., Cav.	do	Vol	No.
234	Connell, William M., Cav.	New York	Vol	No.
235	Taylor, Theodore B., Cav.	do	Vol	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
COLONELS—continued				
237	Monroe, William H., C. A. C.	West Virginia	Vol	No.
238	Schultz, Theodore, F. D.	Missouri	Vol	No.
239	Ellis, Richard T., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Vol	No.
242	Grant, Homer B., C. A. C.	Massachusetts	Vol	No.
244	Greig, Alexander, jr., C. A. C.	do	Vol	No.
245	Chappelear, Louis S., A. G. D.	At large, California	Vol	No.
248	Woods, Robert F., C. A. C.	South Carolina	Vol	No.
252	Hand, Daniel W., F. A.	At large, Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
253	Lambdin, William McK., F. D.	At large, Texas	Vol	No.
260	Galleher, Paul C., Inf.	Kentucky	Vol	No.
261	Fries, Claude S., Inf.	New Jersey	Vol	No.
262	Kimbrough, James M., Inf.	At large, Georgia	Vol	No.
264	Hilgard, Milosh R., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Vol	No.
271	Cooper, Harry L., Inf.	At large, Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
272	Willard, Charles L., Q. M. C.	Texas	Vol	No.
273	Caffey, Lochlin W., Inf.	Georgia	Vol	No.
275	Ragsdale, Robert O., Inf.	Tennessee	Vol	No.
280	Hicks, George L., A. G. D.	Maryland	Vol	No.
281	Quinlan, Dennis P., J. A. G. D.	At large, Michigan	Vol	Yes.
290	Shartle, Samuel G., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
303	Young, Frederick S., Inf.	Texas	Vol	No.
308	Wilson, Jennings B., A. G. D.	At large, Indiana	Vol	No.
315	Bowman, George T., Cav.	At large, New York	Vol	No.
317	England, George W., Inf.	At large, District of Columbia	Vol	No.
319	Herringshaw, William F., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Vol	No.
335	Bunker, Clarence G., C. A. C.	Minnesota	Vol	No.
359	Shelley, James E., Q. M. C.	Alabama	Vol	No.
360	Calvert, Edward, Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Army	No.
371	Wagner, John A., Q. M. C.	North Carolina	Vol	No.
373	Thomas, Charles O., jr., Cav.	At large, Tennessee	Vol	No.
388	Austin, W. A., Cav.	At large, Ohio	Vol	Yes.
394	Ellis, Rowland B., Cav.	California	Vol	No.
397	Turner, Frederick G., Cav.	At large, New York	Vol	No.
437	Gunster, Walter E., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
451	Ohnstad, John C., C. A. C.	Wisconsin	Vol	No.
453	Abbott, Edmund C., J. A. G. D.	New Mexico	Em	No.
454	Weeks, William C., C. E.	At large, Minnesota	Em	No.
455	Rigby, William C., J. A. G. D.	Illinois	Em	No.
LIEUTENANT COLONELS				
52	Cocke, John, Cav.	New Jersey	Army	No.
53	Menges, Wm. H., F. D.	Indiana	Army	No.
55	Cole, Otis R., Inf.	Michigan	Army	No.
56	Coppock, Edward R., F. A.	Indiana	Army	No.
58	Behr, Francis J., C. A. C.	Germany	Army	No.
59	Turner, Fred H., Inf.	Indiana	Army	No.
61	Fisher, Arthur G., A. C.	Maryland	Army	No.
62	Saunders, Edwin O., J. A. G. D.	Kentucky	Army	No.
64	Singleton, Asa L., Inf.	Georgia	Army	No.
65	Bump, Arthur L., Inf.	Wisconsin	Army	No.
68	Campbell, Staley A., Inf.	Illinois	Army	No.
69	Brewer, John R., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
70	McAdams, John P., Inf.	Kentucky	Army	No.
72	Wetherill, Richard, Inf.	Wisconsin	Army	No.
74	Wells, Harry A., Inf.	Kansas	Army	No.
76	Harris, George W., Inf.	Indiana	Army	No.
77	Stevens, Pat M., Inf.	Georgia	Army	No.
78	Peek, Wm. H., F. A.	Virginia	Army	No.
80	Fulmer, John J., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Army	No.
81	McMullen, Jos. I., J. A. G. D.	Virginia	Army	No.
82	Bristol, Matt C., F. D.	England	Army	No.
85	Tompkins, Daniel D., Cav.	Maryland	Army	No.
86	Dougherty, Clarence A., Cav.	Mississippi	Vol	Yes.
87	Hosfield, Henry, Inf.	Germany	Army	No.
88	Martin, Isaac S., Cav.	Virginia	Army	No.
89	Delaplane, Channing E., Inf.	do	Army	No.
91	Somerville, Geo. R., Cav.	Canada	Army	No.
93	Strayer, Thorne, Inf.	Maryland	Army	No.
94	Parker, Hugh A., Inf.	Texas	Army	No.
97	Clapham, John F., A. G. D.	New York	Army	No.
98	Alfante, Wm. A., Inf.	Indiana	Army	No.
99	Nolan, Daniel A., Inf.	New York	Army	No.
100	Buchann, Edmund A., Cav.	Pennsylvania	Army	No.
103	Compton, Goodwin, S. C.	Mississippi	Army	No.
105	Herren, Sam P., Inf.	Texas	Army	No.
110	O'Loughlin, Wm. J., Inf.	New York	Vol	Yes.
111	Mann, Herbert E., Cav.	At large, New York	Vol	No.
115	Smalley, Howard, R., Cav.	Vermont	Vol	No.
116	Scott, John, Inf.	At large, Kentucky	Civ	Yes.
119	Smith, Talbot, Cav.	At large, Georgia	Vol	No.
120	Davis, Frank E., Q. M. C.	At large, Indiana	Vol	No.
124	Jewett, Frank, F., Inf.	Minnesota	Vol	No.
126	Hickox, Alfred A., Inf.	Michigan	Army	No.
127	Talbot, Samuel G., A. G. D.	At large, Virginia	Vol	No.
128	Walling, Jason M., Inf.	New York	Army	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
LIEUTENANT COLONELS—continued				
129	Wesson, Chas. M., Ord. D.	Maryland	MA	No.
133	Paegelow, John A., A. C.	Missouri	Em	Yes.
135	Ross, Clarence B., C. A. C.	Massachusetts	Vol	No.
136	Jordan, Richard H., Q. M. C.	At large, Virginia	Vol	No.
137	Bowen, Wm. S., C. A. C.	Nebraska	Army	No.
138	Jones, Wm. F., F. A.	At large, Alabama	Vol	No.
139	Taylor, James B., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
142	Harris, Emmet R., Cav.	Virginia	Army	No.
145	Geere, Frank, C. A. C.	Wyoming	Vol	No.
146	Wertenbaker, Geo. L., C. A. C.	Virginia	Vol	No.
147	Baker, Walter C., C. W. S.	Pennsylvania	Vol	No.
149	Clark, Chas. A., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Vol	No.
151	Patterson, Wm. L., A. G. D.	Maryland	Civ	No.
154	Jansen, Thos. E., F. D.	District of Columbia	Em	Yes.
157	Ralston, Robt. R., C. E.	Pennsylvania	MA	No.
158	Brooke, Mark, C. E.	do	MA	No.
163	Moran, Edward J., Inf.	New York	MA	No.
165	Rehkopf, Ned B., F. A.	Iowa	MA	No.
169	Foley, Oscar, Cav.	Missouri	MA	No.
172	Mitchell, Henry E., Cav.	At large, District of Columbia	MA	No.
173	Cowles, Wm. H., Cav.	North Carolina	MA	No.
174	Black, Fred'k F., Inf.	Maine	MA	No.
175	McCaun, Wm. A., Q. M. C.	Mississippi	MA	No.
177	Taulbee, Jos. F., Q. M. C.	Kentucky	MA	No.
178	Cooper, Hiram M., Inf.	Georgia	MA	No.
181	Edwards, Wm. W., Cav.	Missouri	MA	No.
184	Bamberger, Raymond S., A. G. D.	Kentucky	Army	No.
186	Mueller, Albert H., Cav.	Illinois	Army	No.
187	Sutherland, Samuel J., Inf.	Iowa	Army	No.
188	Lecoeq, Franc, C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Army	No.
192	Sampson, Odiorne H., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Army	No.
193	Brandt, Alfred, Inf.	Germany	Army	No.
196	Whelen, Townsend, Ord. D.	Pennsylvania	Civ	No.
202	Bennett, Claire R., Q. M. C.	Washington	Civ	No.
224	Aleshire, Olan C., Cav.	Illinois	MA	No.
227	Patterson, Chas. H., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	MA	No.
232	Mars, James A., C. A. C.	Illinois	MA	No.
234	Colvin, Wm. M., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	MA	No.
236	Hunt, Elvid, Inf.	New York	MA	No.
248	Lynn, Clark, A. G. D.	Illinois	MA	No.
258	Bowman, Everett N., Inf.	Iowa	MA	No.
258	Nelson, Geo. E., F. A.	Vermont	Cav	No.
264	Chaffin, Andrew D., Inf.	Tennessee	Army	No.
265	Boschen, Fred W., F. D.	New York	Army	No.
267	Schudt, Chas. O., F. D.	Illinois	Army	No.
271	Hixson, Arthur G., Cav.	Michigan	Army	No.
273	Blyth, James, Q. M. C.	Scotland	Army	No.
278	Rich, Albert T., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Army	No.
320	Singles, Walter, C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	MA	No.
328	Corbly, John B., Inf.	Ohio	Army	No.
377	Overholser, Forrest E., Inf.	do	Army	No.
379	Barry, Archie W., A. C.	Mississippi	Army	No.
444	Blaine, Robert, Cav.	Iowa	Army	No.
446	Connolly, Wm. J., Inf.	Ireland	Army	No.
450	Chandler, Louis B., Inf.	Delaware	Vol	No.
585	Crockett, Cary I., Inf.	Virginia	Civ	No.
MAJORS				
645	Hall, Henry W., Cav.	Alabama	MA	No.
647	Whitley, Franklin L., A. G. D.	Missouri	MA	No.
650	Wilbourn, Arthur E., Cav.	Virginia	MA	No.
651	Cutrer, Emile V., Inf.	Mississippi	MA	No.
652	Crea, Harry B., Inf.	Illinois	MA	No.
656	Hill, Roy A., Inf.	Kansas	MA	No.
658	Spencer, Theodore K., Inf.	Massachusetts	MA	No.
660	Watson, Edwin M., F. A.	Virginia	MA	No.
662	Miller, Edgar S., Inf.	Pennsylvania	MA	No.
663	Sneed, Albert L., A. C.	Arkansas	MA	No.
664	Baker, Lester D., Inf.	Connecticut	MA	No.
666	Fenner, Raymond H., C. A. C.	California	Civ	No.
669	Somers, Richard H., Ord. Dept.	New Jersey	MA	No.
671	Phelps, Frederick C., Inf.	Texas	Army	Yes.
674	Rogers, Joseph A., F. A.	do	Army	Yes.
679	Moore, Harry T., Q. M. C.	California	Em	No.
680	Foster, Reginald L., Q. M. C.	New York	Em	No.
682	Brown, Austin H., F. D.	West Virginia	Em	No.
683	MacKie, Arthur H., Inf.	New York	Em	No.
684	Dishman, Samuel R., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em	No.
685	McDonald, Chas. H., J. A. G. D.	Wisconsin	Em	No.
686	Williams, Chas. R., J. A. G. D.	Georgia	Em	No.
687	King, Edward P., Jr., F. A.	do	Civ	No.
689	Pirie, John H., A. C.	Texas	Civ	No.
691	Reynold, Eugene, C. E.	Delaware	Civ	No.
693	Marr, Harold E., F. A.	Maine	Civ	No.
694	Pitz, Hugo E., C. A. C.	Louisiana	Civ	No.
700	Clark, Oral E., Inf.	Michigan	Civ	No.
702	Brabson, Joe R., F. A.	Tennessee	Civ	No.
703	Kobbe, Herman, Cav.	California	Civ	No.
707	Maddux, Rufus F., C. W. S.	Kentucky	Civ	No.
709	Stutesman, John H., Inf.	Indiana	Civ	No.
712	Sarratt, James A., Inf.	South Carolina	Civ	No.
713	Knight, Willis C., C. A. C.	Washington	Civ	No.
715	Harris, John T., Q. M. C.	West Virginia	Civ	No.
718	Prince, Frederick A., F. A.	Illinois	Civ	No.
719	Mather, John, Ord. Dept.	Massachusetts	Civ	No.
724	Smith, John Piper, C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Civ	No.
725	Kochler, Geo. R., Inf.	New Jersey	Civ	No.
726	Wood, Oliver S., Inf.	Arkansas	MA	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
MAJORS—continued				
728	Smith, Edwin K., C. A. C.	Tennessee	Civ	No.
729	Dougherty, Louis R., F. A.	California	Civ	No.
730	Hopkins, Samuel R., F. A.	Maryland	Civ	No.
731	Daly, Charles D., F. A.	Massachusetts	MA	No.
735	Lathrop, Elbe A., Inf.	Minnesota	Civ	No.
737	Campbell, Arthur G., C. A. C.	Virginia	Civ	No.
738	Palen, Mathew A., Inf.	California	Civ	No.
739	Martin, Frederick L., A. C.	Indiana	Civ	No.
740	Weid, Seth L., Inf.	Maryland	Army	No.
741	Straughn, Hugh, P. S.	Louisiana	Army	No.
742	Johnson, Alza C., J. A. G. D.	Iowa	Em	No.
743	Reilly, Frank C., A. G. D.	New York	Em	Yes.
744	Cline, Walter D., J. A. G. D.	Ohio	Em	No.
745	Rice, Henry L., Ord. Dept.	District of Columbia	Em	No.
746	Tripp, Harry M., C. E.	Wisconsin	Em	No.
747	Butler, John S., C. E.	Tennessee	Em	No.
748	Roberts, Chas., M., Ord. Dept.	Texas	Em	No.
749	Parfit, Edward, P. S.	Canada	Army	Yes.
751	Buerkle, William, Inf.	Missouri	Em	Yes.
752	Rogers, Fred'k C., Inf.	Minnesota	Civ	No.
754	Bowen, Burton E., Inf.	New York	Army	Yes.
759	Herman, Paul H., C. A. C.	Maryland	Civ	No.
760	Warner, Oscar C., C. A. C.	Illinois	Civ	No.
763	Fulton, Wm S., C. A. C.	Louisiana	Civ	No.
767	Bennett, Eli E., C. A. C.	Maryland	Civ	No.
768	McCleave, Wm., F. A.	Colorado	Civ	No.
775	North, Earl, C. E.	Michigan	MA	No.
788	Johnson, Ronald D., F. A.	Oregon	MA	No.
800	Philoon, Wallace C., Inf.	Maine	MA	No.
801	Meyer, Chas B., C. A. C.	Wisconsin	MA	No.
803	Hill, James R., Q. M. C.	Wyoming	MA	No.
807	Titus, Isaac E., C. W. S.	Ohio	Civ	No.
809	Denson, Eley P., Inf.	North Carolina	MA	No.
822	Plasmeyer, Joseph, Cav.	Missouri	MA	No.
828	Ford, Louis P., Inf.	Tennessee	MA	No.
831	Moss, Wentworth, H., Inf.	Idaho	MA	No.
833	Wilson, Alfred M., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Civ	No.
839	Acheson, Herbert H., C. A. C.	Ohio	Civ	No.
844	Bender, Louis B., Sig. C.	Washington	Civ	No.
846	Price, Frederic A., C. A. C.	New Jersey	Civ	No.
849	Frazier, William D., C. A. C.	New York	Civ	No.
858	Reynolds, Chas C., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Army	No.
859	Tierney, James H., Inf.	Michigan	Army	No.
860	Armstrong, Fred'k M., Inf.	New York	Army	No.
861	Thomas, Joseph C., Inf.	Georgia	Army	No.
862	Nichol, Isaac J., Inf.	Tennessee	Army	No.
863	Stelling, John A., P. S.	Minnesota	Army	No.
864	Kelleher, Wm P., Inf.	Massachusetts	Army	No.
865	Fowler, Godfrey R., Inf.	California	Em	No.
866	Milam, Robert M., F. A.	Tennessee	Em	No.
867	Finley, Gordon L., J. A. G. D.	California	Em	No.
868	Wild, Herbert J., C. E.	Pennsylvania	Em	No.
869	Parkhurst, Harleigh F. A.	New York	Em	No.
870	Cameron, Harry F., C. E.	Maine	Em	No.
871	Colburn, Alvin, Inf.	Massachusetts	Em	Yes.
872	Jones, William A., Inf.	Florida	Em	No.
873	Tyler, Walter P., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em	No.
874	Kilpatrick, John D., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em	No.
875	Stack, William A., Inf.	Virginia	Em	No.
876	Stokes, Charles A., Inf.	Georgia	Em	No.
877	Philpot, Sheppard B., Inf.	Iowa	Em	No.
878	Warren, Shields, Inf.	Florida	Em	No.
879	Cresson, Charles C., J. A. G. D.	Texas	Em	No.
880	Burns, William F., J. A. G. D.	Illinois	Em	No.
881	Allen, James W. F., Inf.	Minnesota	Em	Yes.
882	Blair, William R., Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em	No.
883	Mitchell, Drury K., Q. M. C.	South Carolina	Em	No.
884	Lemon, George F., Ord. Dept.	Illinois	Em	No.
885	Tingle, Clarence H., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em	No.
886	MacDonald, John Q., Ord. Dept.	Illinois	Em	No.
887	Lyon, Leon E., C. of E.	Virginia	Em	No.
888	Bailey, Neil E., Q. M. C.	Arizona	Em	No.
889	King, Thomas W., Inf.	California	Em	Yes.
891	Maddox, Francis M., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em	No.
892	Reeves, LeRoy, J. A. G. D.	Tennessee	Em	No.
893	Lemen, William C., C. of E.	New Jersey	Em	No.
894	Patten, Louis P., Inf.	Ohio	Em	Yes.
895	Buck, Charles S., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em	No.
896	Hall, Theodore, J. A. G. D.	Ohio	Em	No.
897	Bloor, Alfred W., Inf.	Texas	Em	No.
898	Krimbill, Walter M., J. A. G. D.	Illinois	Em	No.
899	Sheridan, Henry H. K., Ord. Dept.	Ohio	Em	No.
901	Browne, Frederick W., F. D.	Iowa	Em	No.
902	Fitz, Harold G., F. A.	New York	Em	No.
904	Ropes, Elihu H., C. E.	New Jersey	Em	No.
905	Tillotson, Lee S., J. A. G. D.	Vermont	Em	No.
906	Halliday, Frank W., J. A. G. D.	Maine	Em	No.
907	Holmes, Frank M., F. D.	District of Columbia	Em	No.
912	Ramee, Par, Inf.	Minnesota	Em	No.
914	Lantz, Charles H., P. S.	do	Civ	No.
925	Cottrell, Joseph F., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em	No.
932	Rogers, Thornton, Inf.	Maryland	Em	No.
937	Fowler, Raymond F., C. E.	Nebraska	MA	No.
960	Seydel, Fred, C. A. C.	Iowa	MA	No.
985	Haines, Ralph E., C. A. C.	California	Civ	No.
989	Roth, Edward, Jr., A. G. D.	Massachusetts	Civ	No.
993	Danielson, Wilnot A., Q. M. C.	Iowa	Civ	No.
997	Savage, Emmert W., Inf.	Army	Army	Yes.
1000	Cordiner, Douglas C., Q. M. C.	Wyoming	Civ	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
MAJORS—continued				
1002	Carroll, Benjamin L., F. A.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
1010	Hyatt, John W., Inf.	Virginia	Civ.	No.
1011	Hardenbergh, Raymond W., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
1012	Valliant, Rigby D., Q. M. C.	Arkansas	Em.	No.
1013	Willis, James A., J. A. G. D.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
1014	Luberoff, George, Q. M. C.	Louisiana	Em.	Yes.
1015	Hitchcock, Arthur B., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
1016	O'Brien, Michael J., A. G. D.	New York	Em.	Yes.
1017	Jacobson, Benjamin L., F. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
1018	Turner, Edward W., C. A. C.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
1019	Lemmon, Fred L., Inf.	Kansas	Em.	No.
1020	Turnbull, William A., J. A. G. D.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
1021	McCormick, Chester B., F. A.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
1022	Smith William Alexander, Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
1023	Hill, George P., J. A. G. D.	New York	Em.	No.
1024	Pate, Joseph B., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
1025	Wilson, Louis C., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
1026	Perry, Charles E., C. E.	New York	Em.	No.
1027	Bitzing, Henry R., J. A. G. D.	North Dakota	Em.	No.
1028	Auer, Harry A., J. A. G. D.	Ohio	Em.	No.
1029	Easton, John D., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	No.
1030	McCarthy, Charles E., Inf.	Nevada	Em.	No.
1031	Traeger, Charles H., Ord. Dept.	Virginia	Em.	No.
1032	Parker, John A., J. A. G. D.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
1033	Connor, William M., J. A. G. D.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
1034	McCants, Sam L., Inf.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
1035	Foss, John W., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
1036	Dyer, Charles W., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
1037	O'Toole, Laurence S., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
1038	Taylor, Roger, Ord. Dept.	New York	Em.	No.
1039	Green, Henry L., Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	No.
1040	Blair, George, Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
1041	Lyman, Elbert J., Inf.	Alabama	Em.	No.
1042	Stilwell, Tom K. P., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
1043	Alcott, Robert K., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
1044	Smith, Lucius M., J. A. G. D.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
1045	Guerin, Mark E., J. A. G. D.	Illinois	Em.	No.
1046	Llewellyn, Fred W., J. A. G. D.	Washington	Em.	No.
1047	Young, Laurence W., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
1048	Wilson, Ralph W., C. A. C.	Army	Army	Yes.
1057	Dennis, Edward B., C. A. C.	Ohio	Civ.	No.
1063	White, James M., Inf.	Army	Em.	Yes.
1064	Shearer, Spencer E., P. S.	Pennsylvania	Civ.	Yes.
1065	Brezina, Frank, P. S.	Army	Army	Yes.
1066	Barry, Henry B., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Army	Yes.
1067	Bagley, James W., C. E.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
1068	Boots, Henry A., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
1069	Stiness, Henry W., Inf.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
1070	Clement, John K., Ord. Dept.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
1071	Hedrick, Lawrence H., J. A. G. D.	South Dakota	Em.	No.
1072	Halpin, Robert J., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
1073	Fletcher, Allen, Inf.	California	Em.	No.
1074	Allen, Oliver, Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
1075	Browne, Bowyer B., C. E.	Virginia	Em.	No.
1077	Heritage, Arthur M., C. W. S.	New York	Em.	No.
1078	Elliott, Malcolm, C. E.	Alabama	Em.	No.
1079	Waltz, Millard F., Jr., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
1080	Pickering, Woodell A., Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
1081	Sumner, Lee, Inf.	Kansas	Army	Yes.
1082	Cramer, Myron C., J. A. G. D.	Washington	Em.	No.
1083	Smith, John Abdiel, J. A. G. D.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
1084	Graham, George W., Ord. Dept.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
1088	Mortenson, Gunner J., P. S.	District of Columbia	Civ.	Yes.
1092	Lackland, Frank D., A. C.	do.	Civ.	No.
1096	Boettcher, Arthur, Inf.	At large	Army	Yes.
1170	Brady, Robert C., Q. M. C.	Army	Army	Yes.
1196	Richardson, Ford, Inf.	Maryland	Civ.	No.
1233	FitzGerald, Shepler W., A. C.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
1250	Bennett, Lloyd B., Inf.	Illinois	P. S.	No.
1251	Garfinkel, Abraham, P. S.	Army	Army	Yes.
1253	Lynch, Thomas A., P. S.	do.	Army	Yes.
1254	Oliver, Edward J., Inf.	Wisconsin	P. S.	No.
1255	Tucker, Albert, Inf.	Army	Army	Yes.
1259	Tuteur, Clifford M., F. A.	Pennsylvania	P. S.	No.
1264	McCabe, Frank T., Inf.	Army	Army	Yes.
1265	Tipton, Arthur C., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
1266	Hanford, Edward C., F. A.	Washington	Em.	No.
1267	Wheeler, Merrill D., Q. M. C.	Vermont	Em.	No.
1268	Stickney, Henry H., C. E.	New York	Em.	No.
1299	Williams, Williams C., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
1300	Hill, Lester S., Jr., J. A. G. D.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
1301	King, Archibald, J. A. G. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
1302	Munson, Frederick G., J. A. G. D.	New York	Em.	No.
1303	Seals, Carl H., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
1304	Watson, James A., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
1305	McCoy, Gordon H., F. A.	Utah	Em.	No.
1306	Cole, Robert B., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
1307	Taulbee, Milton H., F. A.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
1308	Lanagan, William H., C. E.	California	Em.	No.
1309	Brown, Sidney G., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
1310	Culberson, William L., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
1311	Donaldson, George C., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
1312	Shutan, William H., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
1313	Davidson, Joseph H., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
1314	Brennan, Russell H., J. A. G. D.	do.	Em.	No.
1315	Brackenbury, Benjamin A., C. W. S.	California	Em.	No.
1316	Dinsmore, John P., J. A. G. D.	Texas	Em.	No.
1317	Thomas, Charles W., Jr., Inf.	California	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
MAJORS—continued				
1318	Presbrey, Oliver H., Ord. Dept.	New York	Em.	No.
1399	Coleman, Fred H., A. C.	Pennsylvania	USMA	No.
1448	Gotwals, John C., C. E.	New York	Em.	No.
1534	Halbert, Edward O., C. A. C.	Army	Army	Yes.
1554	McCarron, Thomas R., Inf.	do.	Army	Yes.
1555	Adamson, Keith F., Ord. Dept.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
1556	Bonney, Frank E., Inf.	Kansas	Em.	No.
1557	Hazlett, Harry F., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
1597	Gallup, Fred H., F. A.	Iowa	MA	No.
1638	Steel, George H., Q. M. C.	Indiana	MA	No.
1758	Baker, Francis J., F. D.	Illinois	Civ.	Yes.
1759	Hopkins, Eugene O., F. D.	Kansas	Civ.	Yes.
1760	Morey, Dana W., F. D.	Ohio	Civ.	No.
1763	Eckels, George Z., F. D.	New York	Civ.	Yes.
1765	Exley, Clarence M., F. D.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
1766	Gralund, Otto W., F. D.	Illinois	Civ.	No.
1767	Foster, Horace G., F. D.	California	Civ.	Yes.
1768	MacKay, James, F. D.	Colorado	Civ.	Yes.
1769	Pugh, Thomas S., F. D.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
1770	Beard, Stephen, R., F. D.	Oregon	Civ.	Yes.
1771	Morton, Emmet C., F. D.	Missouri	Civ.	No.
1772	Willis, Archie, H., F. D.	California	Civ.	No.
1773	Conegys, Edward T., F. D.	Ohio	Civ.	No.
1774	Rice, Horace G., F. D.	Wisconsin	Civ.	Yes.
1775	Legg, Montgomery, T., F. D.	New York	Civ.	No.
1776	Marmon, James A., F. D.	Iowa	Civ.	No.
1777	Dabney, Walter D., F. D.	Virginia	Civ.	No.
1778	MacNicholl, Wm. A., F. D.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
1779	Halla, Carl F., F. D.	South Dakota	Civ.	No.
1782	Cave, Richard L., F. D.	Virginia	Civ.	No.
1783	Maxwell, Alfred J., F. D.	New York	Civ.	No.
1786	Ely, Edwin F., F. D.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
1873	Bishop, Carl A., Inf.	Army	Army	Yes.
2211	Dent, Joseph H., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	Yes.
2212	Ward, J. Moultrie, Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2214	Grey, James M., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
2215	Reeve, Arnold M., Q. M. C.	Tennessee	Em.	Yes.
2216	Ocker, William C., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
2217	Volandt, William F., A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
2244	Cowen, Guy G., Inf.	Vermont	Em.	No.
2245	Browne, Myron G., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
2246	Focardi, Pier L., C. E.	New York	Em.	No.
2247	Todd, Irvin V., F. D.	Nebraska	Em.	Yes.
2248	Freer, Romeo H., Q. M. C.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
2249	Coykendall, Horatio G., F. D.	Arizona	Em.	No.
2250	Doyle, Thomas W., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
2251	Hockwald, Henry, Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
2252	Gale, Carroll M., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
2254	Cutler, Odber M., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
2255	Forsythe, Robert G., Sig. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
2256	Paxton, Orsen E., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
2257	Locke, Thomas C., Q. M. C.	Alabama	Em.	No.
2258	Corbin, George A., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
2259	Kinnard, Harry W. O., F. A.	Texas	Em.	No.
2260	Seales, Howard N., Inf.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
2261	McAdam, William A., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
2263	Lennon, Bert M., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
2264	Rehmann, Edward J., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
2265	Nankivell, John H., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
2266	Moyer, Charles S., C. W. S.	New York	Em.	No.
2267	Heap, Theodore P., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2268	Lockhead, Frank, Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
2269	Pillsbury, Dennis C., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
2270	Wickliffe, Charles A., J. A. G. D.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
2250	McGehee, Schaumburg, F. A.	Louisiana	Em.	No.
2261	Milam, John H., F. A.	Tennessee	Em.	Yes.
2262	Rawlter, Emil C., J. A. G. D.	do.	Em.	No.
2263	Rhein, Wade W., C. A. C.	California	Em.	No.
2274	Poage, Robert O., Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
2386	Tiffany, Stephen R., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
2391	Noyes, Halbert H., Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	No.
2392	Maul, Theo. R., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
2393	Nelson, John A., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
CAPTAINS				
2491	Hodapp, Paul A., Q. M. C.	(France) California	Em.	Yes.
2492	Zautner, George H., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
2493	Davis, Ezra, Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
2496	Totten, Gerald H., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
2497	Riter, William F., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
2498	Hardman, Herbert W., Q. M. C.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
2499	Goodrich, John D., Q. M. C.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
2501	Dick, Chester J., F. D.	Illinois	Em.	No.
2503	Connatser, Wm. T., Q. M. C.	Tennessee	Em.	Yes.
2509	Duffill, Harrison M., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
2510	Holland, Thomas L., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
2511	Porter, John A., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2512	Kidwell, Herbert L., Q. M. C.	West Virginia	Em.	Yes.
2516	McGrath, Thomas J., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
2517	Baker, Thomas O., Q. M. C.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
2518	Hahn, George H., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
2519	Douglas, John N., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
2522	Seals, Simeon J., Q. M. C.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
2523	Littell, Alonzo L., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
2524	Longacre, Clarence, Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
2525	Holmes, Percival S., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
2526	Schocklin, John, Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	Yes.
2527	Middleton, C. Lloyd, Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
2528	Schumacher, Geo. H., Q. M. C.	Oregon	Em.	No.
2529	Speed, David M., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
2530	Wagoner, Harry L., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
2531	Hahn, Joseph D., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
2532	Jensen, August C., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2533	Hickey, Joseph H., Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	Yes.
2534	Ettridge, James B., Q. M. C.	Connecticut	Em.	Yes.
2535	Dukes, Wm. H., Q. M. C.	Arkansas	Em.	Yes.
2536	Dilley, Murray B., Sig. C.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
2537	Block, Emil H., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2545	Jenks, Royal G., F. D.	do.	Em.	No.
2546	Cassidy, Wm., Q. M. C.	(England) California	Em.	Yes.
2548	Edwards, Richard T., Q. M. C.	(England) Ohio	Em.	Yes.
2549	Whitworth, Alex. E., Sig. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
2550	Watt, David A., A. G. D.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
2551	Biggar, John, Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	Yes.
2552	Crissy, John W., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2553	Callahan, James W., Jr., P. S.	Army	Em.	Yes.
2554	Doten, Leonard S., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2561	Hanses, Peter, Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
2562	Kerr, Creighton, C. A. C.	South Carolina	Em.	Yes.
2563	Edwards, LeRoy M., F. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
2622	McDonald, John A., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
2623	Massey, Stephen B., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2624	Chappell, Albert J., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
2625	Laughlin, Ed., A. C.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
2626	Meyer, Jack L., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
2627	Correll, Ira A., Cav.	California	Em.	Yes.
2628	Duval, Nelson H., G. A. C.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
2629	Hoppough, Clay I., Sig. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
2630	Wheelin, James, Inf.	Arizona	Em.	Yes.
2631	Dresbach, Harley A., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
2632	Seamon, Walter E., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
2633	During, Fred, Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	Yes.
2634	Meade, Peter F., Q. M. C.	Kansas	Em.	Yes.
2635	Bowles, Jesse R., Inf.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2636	Rush, Clinton, Inf.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
2637	Lambert, Barret D., Inf.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2638	Cline, Wm. M., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2639	Hunt, Lewis E., Q. M. C.	Hawaii	Em.	Yes.
2640	Ainsworth, Charles H., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
2641	Sledge, Theo. J., Inf.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
2642	Hart, Walter, C. A. C.	Louisiana	Em.	Yes.
2643	Brown, Thomas C., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
2644	Johnston, Thomas J., C. W. S.	Massachusetts	Em.	Yes.
2645	Twyman, Joseph Henry, C. A. C.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
2646	Rhodes, John M., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
2647	Higgins, Ernest A., Inf.	At large	Em.	Yes.
2648	Maher, John J., C. A. C.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
2649	Lawrence, James, Sig. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
2650	Williams, Wm. H., Inf.	Florida	Em.	No.
2651	Giffin, Calvin E., A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2689	Ericson, Gustaf H., C. A. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
2690	Lofquist, Fred K., C. A. C.	do.	Em.	Yes.
2691	Hebert, Edmund N., Inf.	do.	Em.	Yes.
2692	Wilson, John H., C. A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2693	Smith, Adrin B., C. A. C.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
2694	Simpson, Oliver T., F. D.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2695	Shannon, Robert E., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
2696	Idzorek, Stephen J., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
2697	Holt, John R., Q. M. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
2698	Blakenship, Jacob A., Cav.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
2699	McNair, Charles H., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
2700	Berg, Elenius, Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	Yes.
2701	Jackson, Orville, Q. M. C.	Army	Em.	Yes.
2702	Palmer, LeRoy H., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2703	Hamilton, Walter C., O. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
2712	Blair, Robert A., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
2713	Hunter, James, Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
2714	Hostetler, Robert L., Inf.	Michigan	Em.	Yes.
2715	Dawson, Mark A., F. A.	Indiana	Em.	No.
2716	Thomas, Elmer G., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
2717	Toy, Channing R., F. A.	New York	Em.	No.
2718	Evans, Roy H., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	Yes.
2719	Douglas, Lewis B., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
2720	Vickers, Robert C., Sig. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
2721	Clark, Thomas L., Sig. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2722	St. Germain, Chambord H., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
2928	Llufrio, John W., Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	Yes.
2929	Quigley, Ray E., P. S.	Army	Em.	Yes.
2930	Realty, Frank J., F. D.	Indiana	Em.	No.
2931	Penn, Jesse W., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	Yes.
2932	Conrad, Gwynne, Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
2933	Vacquerie, Harry A., Q. M. C.	Arkansas	Em.	Yes.
2934	Kelley, Martin L., Q. M. C.	New Mexico	Em.	Yes.
2935	Wiener, Samuel B., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	Yes.
2936	Walsh, Norris P., F. A.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
2943	Saportas, Wm. F., Cav.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2944	Gaskins, Claude E., Inf.	Arkansas	Em.	Yes.
2945	Brockschink, Frank R., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	Yes.
2946	Kain, Oscar, Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
2947	Lundy, Clyde A., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2948	Hendricksen, Chas. S., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
2949	Skaggs, Leland W., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
2950	Hawkinson, Axel, Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	Yes.
2951	Patterson, Harry A., Cav.	Alabama	Em.	Yes.
2952	Cleary, James D., C. E.	California	Em.	No.
2953	Haverfield, Wm. A., Cav.	Arizona	Em.	Yes.
2954	Becker, Daniel, Cav.	Virginia	Em.	Yes.
2955	Roemer, Theo. M., Cav.	Arizona	Em.	Yes.
2956	Ward, James C., Cav.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
2966	Moore, Floyd, Inf.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
2967	Coulter, Charles S., Inf.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
2968	Woodruff, Roy C., Cav.	Virginia	Em.	Yes.
2969	Christman, Harvey N., Cav.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2970	Benson, Harry W., Cav.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
2971	Lucas, John H., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2972	Howder, James W., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
2973	Gray, Clifford A., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
2974	Casey, James, Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	Yes.
2975	Cramer, Charles, Cav.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
2976	Cummings, George P., Cav.	Maine	Em.	Yes.
2977	McBride, John, Inf.	Maryland	Em.	Yes.
2978	Burkett, Charles W., Cav.	Oklahoma	Em.	Yes.
2979	Munteanu, George, Inf.	Army	Em.	Yes.
2980	Gerow, Louis B., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2981	Webster, Oscar T., Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	Yes.
2982	Cooper, Bert E., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
2983	Doyle, Alexander C., Q. M. C.	South Carolina	Em.	Yes.
2984	Bain, Floyd H., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
2985	Easterbrook, Charles A., F. A.	Maine	Em.	Yes.
2986	Cooke, Lorenze I., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
2987	Metcalfe, James, Inf.	Utah	Army	No.
2988	Churchill, Harold W., O. D.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
2989	Wilkinson, Herbert F., Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
2990	Alger, Wm. E., P. S.	New York	Army	Yes.
2991	Ferriter, John P., Sig. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
2992	Whitaker, John C., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
3024	Webbe, Harold W., Sig. C.	New York	Em.	No.
3025	Bundy, Theo., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
3026	Bender, Walter, A. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
3027	Whitesides, John G., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
3028	Chase, Albert G., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
3029	Baldwin, Aubrey H., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
3030	King, Robert W., Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	No.
3031	Miller, Fred G., Sig. C.	do.	Em.	No.
3032	Beebe, Price W., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
3033	Firestone, James J., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
3034	Campbell, James K., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
3035	Wright, Robert L., Inf.	Michigan	Em.	No.
3036	Bachus, J. L., Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
3037	Scholl, Philip A., F. D.	Kansas	Em.	No.
3038	Candler, Wm. D., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
3039	Field, Robert B., Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
3040	Perfect, Chas., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
3041	Houck, Ed. J., Inf.	Illinois	Army	Yes.
3042	Harvey, John J., Inf.	Minnesota	Army	Yes.
3043	Price, Louis H., F. D.	California	Em.	No.
3044	Baker, Edwin O., Sig. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
3045	Borden, Fred G., Sig. C.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
3046	Burkhead, Calvin H., Sig. C.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
3047	Doherty, James F., A. C.	California	Army	Yes.
3048	Kimble, Samuel R., Ord. D.	Kansas	Army	Yes.
3049	Weybark, Geo. W., C. A. C.	Arkansas	Army	Yes.
3050	Ackerman, Alexander S., C. E.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
3051	Yost, Howard M., C. E.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
3106	Lovell, Harry B., F. D.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
3107	Sanders, James A., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
3108	Besse, Edward H., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
3109	Fitzpatrick, Rufo M., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
3110	Jacobs, Lynwood B., A. C.	Delaware	Em.	No.
3111	Peabody, Orland S., Cav.	Oregon	Em.	No.
3112	Cross, George I., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
3113	Hedge, George R., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
3114	Barrows, Ernest R., C. A. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
3115	Hall, Vernon W., C. A. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
3116	Hinman, Burritt H., J. A. G. D.	New Hampshire	Em.	No.
3117	Carter, Wm. M., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
3118	Ladd, Rolla V., C. A. C.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
3119	Nolan, John P., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
3120	Gilbert, Walter J., C. A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
3121	Cook, Frederic W., C. A. C.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
3122	Wilkins, Harold S., O. D.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
3123	Tuttle, Albert L., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
3124	Edgcomb, Franklin E., C. A. C.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
3125	Needham, Sumner H., F. A.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
3126	Hagan, Harry L., Inf.	Maryland	Em.	No.
3127	Dodd, Patrick J., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
3128	Bowler, Louis J., C. A. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
3129	Ellis, Dan M., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
3130	Wright, Frank W., A. C.	Oregon	Em.	No.
3131	Kozlowski, Karol B.	Army	Em.	Yes.
3132	Heller, Eugene J., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.

¹ Navy, yes.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
3166	Chambers, Thomas H., F. D.	Virginia	Em.	No.
3167	O'Connell, Daniel, Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
3168	Koch, Arthur L., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
3169	Jones, Floyd D., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
3171	Cochran, Franklin N., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
3176	Thompson, Gilbert L., S. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
3177	Worley, Wm. A., Q. M. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
3181	Jablonsky, Carl E., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
3185	Cuny, Clifford D., Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
3188	Osborn, Cuthbert A., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	Yes.
3193	McCollum, Wm. B., F. A.	Texas	Em.	No.
3194	Boren, Lemuel E.	do	Em.	Yes.
3195	Berger, Fredk. V., Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	Yes.
3196	Kneass, Wm. E., F. A.	Utah	Em.	No.
3197	Hart, Ed. F., F. A.	Colorado	Em.	No.
3198	Guthrie, Ralph R., Sig. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
3199	Rupert, Archie K., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
3200	Barry, Thomas C., F. A.	Texas	Em.	No.
3201	Allen, Harry B., F. A.	Missouri	Em.	No.
3202	Pickens, Arthur, Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
3203	Walton, Martin C., Jr., F. A.	California	Em.	No.
3204	Harrison, Samuel C., Inf.	Florida	Em.	No.
3206	Hall, Charles R., F. A.	Arkansas	Em.	No.
3207	Jones, Daniel F., F. A.	Missouri	Em.	No.
3208	Mann, Walter M., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
3209	Hughes, Arthur D., Q. M. C.	Idaho	Em.	No.
3210	Harries, Herbert L.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
3421	Lewis, Charles, F. D.	Porto Rico	Em.	Yes.
3426	Boiland, Thomas, A. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
3427	Waldron, Arthur W., C. A. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
3428	Hobson, George F., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
3433	Bell, Dover, Q. M. C.	Army	Em.	Yes.
3436	Kraus, Charles A., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
3437	McMillen, Earl G., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
3438	Kasper, John, Q. M. C.	Rhode Island	Em.	Yes.
3439	Holmes, Wm., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
3440	Kelech, George E., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
3441	Lynch, John, Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
3442	Whitner, Arthur R., Inf.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
3443	Maloy, Ed. J., Q. M. C.	Connecticut	Em.	Yes.
3444	Williams, Carmi L., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
3445	Armstrong, Elmer J.	do	Em.	Yes.
3446	Baldwin, Herbert, F. D.	California	Em.	No.
3447	Smith, Sumner M.	New York	Em.	Yes.
3472	Merrill, Howard N., Inf.	do	Civ.	No.
4032	Bazior, Chas. I., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
4044	Montague, Jeffrey G. A., Inf.	Virginia	Em.	No.
4046	Clarke, James S., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
4047	Wharton, Ira J., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
4048	Sleeper, Eugene H., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4099	Cole, Joseph M., C. A. C.	Vermont	Em.	Yes.
4050	Beck, Thomas C., Inf.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4051	Mechling, Ed. A., Q. M. C.	do	Em.	No.
4052	Gilmore, Michael J., Q. M. C.	Louisiana	Em.	Yes.
4053	Dayhoff, Chas. H., Cav.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
4054	Barber, Archibald L., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
4055	Harrison, William F., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
4056	Myers, Selim W., Inf.	Florida	Em.	No.
4057	Chisolm, Ed. N., C. E.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
4058	Dobbins, Chas. G., F. D.	Georgia	Em.	No.
4059	Sproule, James, Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4060	Springer, Harry R., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
4061	DeWesse, James M., F. A.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
4062	Marsh, Chas. L., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
4063	Schmidt, Joseph J., Inf.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4064	Garrison, Clyde D., Cav.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
4065	Becker, Frank F., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	Yes.
4066	Proctor, Arthur B., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4067	Elson, John H., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
4068	Frazer, George A., J. A. G. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4069	Williamson, Royden, Cav.	New York	Em.	No.
4070	Imperatori, Reginald J., C. A. C.	do	Em.	No.
4071	Quigley, Charles C., A. G. D.	California	Em.	Yes.
4072	Skinner, Guy W., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
4074	Walker, Sherman P., Inf.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
4076	Rass, Frederick W., Inf.	Washington	Em.	No.
4077	Mahoney, William C., Q. M. C.	Florida	Em.	No.
4078	Rice, George T., C. A. C.	do	Em.	Yes.
4079	Brumage, Alpha, F. A.	Missouri	Em.	No.
4080	Sells, Benjamin J., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
4081	Strong, Sherman I., Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	Yes.
4082	Coxetter, James G., F. A.	Florida	Em.	No.
4083	Knight, Louis R., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
4084	Post, Audley M., F. A.	Ohio	Em.	No.
4086	Card, Lee W., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4087	Neely, Robert H., Inf.	North Dakota	Em.	Yes.
4088	Worthley, Leighton E., Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
4089	Woolworth, Gilbert S., J. A. G. D.	New York	Em.	No.
4090	Denning, Henry M., F. D.	Delaware	Em.	No.
4091	Shaw, John A., Inf.	Iowa	Em.	No.
4092	Beecher, Harrison S., Cav.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
4093	Price, Wesley W., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
4094	Knight, Butler L., Inf.	do	Em.	No.
4095	Fowle, Daniel G., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
4096	Lloyd, James P., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4097	Robinson, Edgar E., Inf.	Michigan	Em.	No.
4098	Guy, Thomas E., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.

¹ Navy, yes.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
4099	Harris, Thomas A., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
4100	Moncure, William A. P., Inf.	Virginia	Em.	No.
4101	Loughlin, Charles C., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
4102	Barnard, Thomas W., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
4103	Worrall, Lawrence P., F. D.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
4104	Branson, Don P., Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
4105	Patton, Milton H., Cav.	Alabama	Em.	No.
4106	Whitthorne, Brom H., Q. M. C.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
4107	Rieman, Gilbert, Cav.	Maryland	Em.	No.
4108	Adams, Percy, C. A. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
4109	Boon, Ben B., F. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
4110	Durst, Wallace E., Q. M. C.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
4111	Tuttle, Hiram E., Q. M. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
4112	Denton, Joseph W., M. Q. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4113	Campbell, John W., Inf.	Nebraska	Em.	No.
4114	Long, Joseph A., Ord. D.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
4115	Greenwell, Samuel A., A. G. D.	Texas	Em.	No.
4116	Stewart, Jefferson M., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
4117	Dilts, Howard K., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
4118	Campbell, Stuart D., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
4119	Thompson, John W., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	No.
4120	Edmonds, Henry W., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
4121	Hollingsworth, Geo. C., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
4122	Trapnell, Thomas T., J. A. G. D.	New York	Em.	No.
4123	Ashton, Chas. O., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	Yes.
4124	Watson, Joel F., J. A. G. D.	Illinois	Em.	No.
4125	Engles, Rayburn, Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
4126	Hutcheson, John C., Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
4127	Triplett, Austin, Inf.	Kentucky	Army	No.
4128	Wheeler, Wm. D., A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4129	Worcester, Herbert W., Cav.	Arizona	Em.	No.
4130	Richey, Wm. R., Jr., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
4131	Wolberton, David R., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4132	Harris, Wm. E., C. E.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4133	Lavin, Gregory S., O. D.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4134	Bowen, Arthur F., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
4135	Lewis, Herbert H., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
4136	Perkins, Charles H., Inf.	Idaho	Em.	No.
4137	Ford, Geo. R., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4138	Strickland, Newton H., O. D.	Georgia	Em.	No.
4139	Rowan, John V., Q. M. C.	Iowa	Army	No.
4140	Beers, Wm. H., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
4141	Fitzpatrick, Francis J., C. E.	Washington	Em.	No.
4142	Cronkrite, Willis D., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
4143	Cook, Raymond P., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
4144	Russell, John A., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4145	Barnett, Theo. T., Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
4146	Ray, Wm. A., F. A.	Texas	Em.	No.
4147	Spooner, Lloyd S., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
4148	Savage, Leon E., F. A.	Washington	Em.	No.
4149	Shoemaker, Henry M., Cav.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4150	Colpin, Emmett R., Inf.	Indiana	Army	No.
4151	Hardie, Philip W., C. A. C.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
4152	Morrow, Eugene E., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	No.
4153	Ripptoe, Grover C., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
4154	Slauson, Kinsley W., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4155	Neville, Fred T., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
4156	Fransworth, Louis D., C. A. C.	Utah	Em.	No.
4157	Brockway, Edgar K., Inf.	Florida	Em.	No.
4158	Gwynn, Harry M., Inf.	Maryland	Em.	No.
4159	Crim, Lemuel P., O. D.	Washington	Em.	No.
4160	Scott, J. F. Reynolds, J. A. G. D.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4161	Speece, Newton W., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
4162	Potts, Frank G., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
4163	Manley, Norbert C., F. A.	Utah	Em.	No.
4164	Baxter, John H., Inf.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
4165	Smith, Ridgway P., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
4166	Hackett, Wallace E., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
4167	Tydings, Wm. L., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4168	White, Ernest K., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
4169	Wadelon, Thomas D., Jr., Cav.	New York	Em.	No.
4170	Anderson, B. Conn., F. A.	Texas	Em.	No.
4171	Henry, Wm. J., O. D.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4172	Parmelee, Clyde D., F. A.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
4173	Gregory, Walter, Inf.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
4174	Backman, Stanley G., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
4175	Montgomery, Ray C., F. A.	Iowa	Em.	No.
4176	McCafferty, Grattan H., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4177	Crosson, William H., C. E.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
4178	West, George W., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
4179	Morrosette, James E., J. A. G. D.	Alabama	Em.	No.
4180	Harrison, Augustus S., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
4181	Dalton, William F., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4182	Snyder, Harry C., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
4183	Lees, Franklin B., Q. M. C.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
4184	Buckley, William R., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4185	Shea, George H., Cav.	California	Em.	Yes.
4186	Russell, Edward J. L., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
4187	Phinney, Archie E., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
4188	Connor, Paul D., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
4189	Norris, George B., Inf.	Vermont	Em.	No.
4190	Dyer, Frederic Von M., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
4191	Johnson, John N., Jr., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
4192	Seger, Ralph R., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
4193	Cox, Malcolm R., F. A.	Washington	Em.	No.
4194	Perry, Arthur J., F. D.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4195	Floyd, Arthur, Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4196	Oseth, Ingomar M., Inf.	North Dakota	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
4197	Foreman, Taylor W., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
4198	Cunningham, William A., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
4199	King, George L., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
4200	Zajicek, John F., C. E.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4201	Campbell, Rumsey, F. A.	Illinois	Em.	No.
4202	McGee, Arthur P., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
4203	Lammons, Frank B., Inf.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4204	Rutten, Paul G., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
4205	Buckbee, Egbert J., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
4206	Cooke, George W., F. D.	New York	Em.	No.
4207	Zeman, Anton, Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
4208	Shawn, Franklin D., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4209	Stalsburg, Charles, Q. M. C.	Connecticut	Em.	Yes.
4210	Isley, Charles J., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4211	Bunker, Henry J., Q. M. C.	do	Em.	Yes.
4212	Hagan, Frederick E., Q. M. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
4213	McFadden, Murdoch A., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
4214	Baird, Lewis C., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4215	Cousley, Robert G., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
4216	Bower, Roland C., Q. M. C.	North Dakota	Em.	Yes.
4217	Grove, David, Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
4218	Ely, Ernest W., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
4219	Barbin, James H., Inf.	Louisiana	Em.	Yes.
4220	Harrell, George H., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
4221	Davis, Fred E., Q. M. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
4222	Fain, Reuben L., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4223	Gamble, George D., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
4224	Goodwyn, Carey E., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4225	Eccles, Edward, Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
4226	Wilson, Charles F., Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
4227	Glessner, Hamilton H. T., Sig. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
4228	Guth, Irwin W., Q. M. C.	South Dakota	Em.	Yes.
4229	Gibson, James A. B., Ord. D.	Virginia	Em.	No.
4230	Lobitz, Albert, Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4231	Lachmiller, Edward W., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
4232	Mertz, Frank A., Q. M. C.	Colorado	Em.	Yes.
4233	Etheridge, Asa J., A. C.	North Carolina	Em.	Yes.
4234	Schfield, Earl S., A. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
4235	Stanley, Arthur W., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4236	Huber, Paul F., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	Yes.
4237	Parker, Arthur W., Q. M. C.	Wyoming	Em.	No.
4238	Jackson, Herbert L., Cav.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4239	Seaton, David S., A. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
4240	Smith, Richard L., C. E.	California	Em.	No.
4241	Waugh, William H., C. E.	do	Em.	No.
4242	Barnard, Clarence, Ord. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4243	Corbett, John L., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
4244	Bramble, Walter S., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
4245	Ingram, John V., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4246	Elliott, Stewart H., Ord. D.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
4247	Christophel, John C., Q. M. C.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
4248	Irwin, Asa, Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4249	Lerner, William M., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
4250	Prather, Van Leslie, Q. M. C.	Kansas	Em.	Yes.
4251	Doyle, Edward P., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
4252	White, Robert O., Q. M. C.	South Carolina	Em.	Yes.
4253	Shearman, Walter L., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
4254	Ewing, Hugh F., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
4255	Henson, Elisha K., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
4256	Richmond, Vance L., Inf.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
4257	Findlay, Harris M., F. A.	Virginia	Civ.	No.
4258	Hubbard, John R., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
4259	Armitage, George W., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
4260	Brown, John E., Ord. Dept.	Kansas	Em.	Yes.
4261	Lucas, Charles E., Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	Yes.
4262	White, Will R., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
4263	Bentley, George A., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
4264	Overmyer, Oliver L., Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	Yes.
4265	Kennedy, Thomas, Q. M. C.	Connecticut	Em.	Yes.
4266	Savage, Charles M., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
4267	Sherry, Bartram J., Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
4268	Marshall, Otta, C. A. C.	Mississippi	Em.	Yes.
4269	Butler, Warren A., F. D.	Connecticut	Em.	Yes.
4270	Goodyear, Russell, W., Q. M. C.	New Mexico	Em.	No.
4271	Cope, Jesse D., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
4272	Green, Eldridge A., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	Yes.
4273	Barrell, Frank M., Q. M. C.	Utah	Em.	No.
4274	Root, John A., Ord. Dept.	Montana	Em.	No.
4275	Steteklub, George, Q. M. D.	Wisconsin	Em.	Yes.
4276	Cooper, John W., Q. M. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
4277	Constock, Joseph H., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
4278	Witney, Louis A., Inf.	Utah	Em.	No.
4279	Newell, Carroll H., Inf.	Louisiana	Em.	No.
4280	Gilman, John A., Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
4281	Brock, William T., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
4282	Langley, John E., C. E.	Alabama	Em.	No.
4283	Macy, Lorenzo D., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
4284	de Russy, Rene E., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
4285	Jahant, George A., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
4286	Alway, Curtis D., Inf.	Michigan	Em.	No.
4287	Lampke, Louis J., Inf.	do	Em.	No.
4288	Anderson, Clay, C. E.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
4289	De Votir, Vernon C., Inf.	Colorado	Em.	No.
4290	Stewart, William M., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
4291	Platts, Willis A., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
4292	Warner, Irvin B., F. A.	do	Em.	No.
4293	Grady, Clyde, Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
5071	Freeman, Jesse K., C. A. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
5072	George, Edward M., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
5073	Brooks, Horace J., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
5074	Jones, Morgan E., Inf.	Florida	Em.	No.
5075	Conway, Thomas T., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5076	Rarey, George K., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
5077	Uhrig, Jacob E., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	No.
5078	Murohy, Clarence H., Cav.	North Carolina	Em.	Yes.
5079	Goodwin, Samuel R., Cav.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
5080	Ames, George W., C. A. C.	California	Em.	No.
5081	Brock, Arthur W., Jr., A. C.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5082	Murphy, John J., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
5083	Jarman, Edgar A., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	No.
5084	Higgins, Stanton, Cav.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
5085	Spear, Holden, Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
5086	Lowe, John V., C. W. S.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5087	St. James, Robt. G., Inf.	Colorado	Em.	Yes.
5088	Hazeirig, Wm. R., Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
5089	Maslin, Francis R., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
5090	Carey, Edwin F., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
5091	Estabrook, M. G., Jr., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5092	Russell, Arthur J., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
5093	Fox, Wilbur J., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
5094	Taylor, Frank E., J. A. G. D.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
5095	Burlin, Chas. W., C. E.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5096	Miller, Elmer W., C. A. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
5097	Mitchell, Herbert C., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5098	Chambers, Arthur K., C. A. C.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
5099	Hogge, Paul T., Inf.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
5100	Miller, Chas. S., Cav.	Louisiana	Em.	No.
5101	Stevens, Albert W., A. C.	Idaho	Em.	No.
5102	Peters, Frank C., Q. M. C.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
5103	Svenholt, Helmer, C. E.	do	Em.	No.
5104	Rothrock, Arthur D., Ord.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5105	Witcher, Wm. V., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
5106	Willis, Allan S., Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	Yes.
5107	Davenport, Murray T., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
5108	Burt, William G., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
5109	Lehr, Howard W., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5110	Noyes, Marshall J., C. E.	Kansas	Em.	No.
5111	Walton, Charles M., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	Yes.
5112	Knadler, Versalious L., F. A.	Kansas	Em.	No.
5113	Damon, Samuel L., C. E.	Oregon	Em.	No.
5114	Hartman, Guy L., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
5115	Thomas, Thomas, Inf.	do	Em.	No.
5116	Lull, Thomas C., Inf.	Vermont	Em.	No.
5117	Arnold, Leonard S., F. A.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5118	Burkhalter, Harry N., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
5119	Swick, Charles H., C. E.	New York	Em.	No.
5120	Holmes, Carl G., F. A.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5121	Oleson, Victor L., F. A.	Utah	Em.	No.
5122	Van Gisson, Lewis M., Ord. Dept.	New York	Em.	No.
5123	King, Arthur E., F. A.	Louisiana	Em.	No.
5124	Bassett, Aubrey J., Inf.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
5125	Deroin, Frank A., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5126	Sperry, Gottfried W., Inf.	Idaho	Em.	No.
5127	Ayres, Harry D., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
5128	Kaech, Edward A., Inf.	South Dakota	Em.	No.
5129	Waters, Edwin U. O., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5130	Wise, William W., C. W. S.	Missouri	Em.	No.
5131	Gaston, Frederick H., F. A.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5132	Gorman, John J., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
5133	Jones, Rodney C., C. A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5134	Mayer, George M., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
5135	Murphy, William A., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5136	Elarth, Harold H., Inf.	Nebraska	Em.	No.
5137	Birdseye, Mortimer B., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
5138	Harris, Lester J., Sig. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
5139	Clark, Howard F., C. E.	California	Em.	No.
5140	Brenizer, Howard C., F. A.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5141	Forbes, Morris H., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
5142	Rutherford, Dorsey J., C. A. C.	California	Em.	No.
5143	Melin, Reynold F., Ord. Dept.	Oregon	Em.	No.
5144	Starrett, Carl H., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5145	Baird, Arthur R., Ord. Dept.	California	Em.	No.
5146	Benedict, Arthur L., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5147	Larson, Leander, Q. M. C.	do	Em.	Yes.
5148	Fitzgerald, Francis V., Q. M. C.	Utah	Em.	No.
5149	Orrill, Ade, Inf.	California	Em.	No.
5150	Hagan, Eugene E., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
5151	Schillo, Joseph E., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
5152	Nurse, Howard B., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
5153	Bass, Fred T., C. E.	do	Em.	No.
5154	Byers, Rufus A., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
5155	Adamson, George E., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
5156	Mills, Thomas H., Q. M. C.	do	Em.	Yes.
5157	Schraier, Edward O., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
5158	Thiessen, Alfred H., Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5159	Hostetter, Elmer, Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
5160	Gorton, G. D., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
5161	Gray, Claude E., F. D.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
5162	Page, Edwin R., A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5163	Thumel, Abraham B., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
5164	McKeever, Bernard E., Q. M. C.	do	Em.	No.
5165	Adair, Zane, L., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
5166	Muller, William G., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
5167	Randall, William V., Ord. Dept.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5168	Parker, Will V., Sig. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5169	Montgomery, Harry G., A. C.	Nebraska	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
CAPTAINS—continued				
5608	Anthony, James G., Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5612	Allen, Richard, Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
5621	Smith, James Eugene, Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5623	Barbee, Biglow B., F. D.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
5624	Blanchard, Edward B., C. W. S.	Hawaii	Em.	No.
5634	Banbury, Thomas, Q. M. C.	Oregon	Em.	No.
5635	Cashman, William E., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
5651	Ames, Alston B., Q. M. C.	Kansas	Em.	Yes.
5652	Mathews, Eugene G., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
5657	Vandervoort, Benjamin F., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
5677	Stevenson, Joseph H., C. E.	do.	Em.	No.
5704	Gardner, Harry F., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5706	Dunn, Frank, Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
5728	Yount, Fred T., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
5731	Albro, Ames S., A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5738	Taylor, George F. R., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	Yes.
5769	Coons, Daniel D., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
5778	Canfield, Joseph B., Q. M. C.	Oregon	Em.	No.
5779	Antonovich, Emile P., Capt. Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
5784	Hall, Bovey M., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
5806	Boykin, Richard P., Capt. Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
5807	Wood, Charles W., Sig. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
5810	Dersheimer, Alexander P., Capt. Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5812	Tunis, Harry O., Capt. C. E.	Arizona	Em.	No.
5814	Sallee, Howard, Q. M.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
5815	Gahan, John J., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
5832	Wotkys, Grosvenor L., Ord. Dept.	California	Em.	No.
5839	Fox, Albert, J., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
5850	Hill, Guy, Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5851	Savage, Lawrence B., Q. M. C.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
5865	Ulmo, Jerry W., C. A. C.	Arizona	Em.	No.
FIRST LIEUTENANTS				
5871	Dailey, Raymond, Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5872	Chandler, Homer B., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
5873	Pyle, Carl W., A. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
5874	Merritt, Herbert L., P. S.	Army	Em.	Yes.
5875	Shults, Fermon A., P. S.	do.	Em.	Yes.
5876	Day, Wm., Q. M. C.	At large	Em.	Yes.
5877	Coyne, Frederick E., Jr., F. A.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
5878	McCulloch, John M., A. C.	Kentucky	Em.	Yes.
5879	LeBrou, Richard K., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
5880	Sullivan, Charles W., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5883	Chandler, Geo. M., Capt. Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	No.
5884	Oppermann, Irving A., Capt. Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
5885	Waite, Wm., Capt. Inf.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
5886	Kunzmann, Wm. J., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
5887	Barksdale, John A., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
5888	Brown, Handy V., Inf.	Arkansas	Em.	Yes.
5889	DeWitt, Ernest A., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	Yes.
5890	Nash, Vernon L., Inf.	Connecticut	Em.	Yes.
5893	Lamb, George E., Capt. Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5894	Godwin, Harold O., Capt. Q. M. C.	do.	Em.	No.
5895	Smith, Harold W., C. A. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
5896	Boettcher, Henry J., Inf.	Maryland	Em.	No.
5898	Asp, Melvin B., A. C.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
5900	Woolverton, Robert B., Capt. Sig. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5901	Bowman, Orley D., C. A. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
5902	McDonald, George C., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5903	Weed, Thomas J., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
5904	Skanss, Peter E., A. C.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
5905	Waller, Alfred E., A. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
5906	Moore, Harold A., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5908	Shannonhouse, John G., C. W. S.	California	Em.	No.
5909	Gilruth, James A., Inf.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
5910	Moon, Odas, A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
5911	McNiel, Jacob R., Capt., F. D.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
5912	Clark, Henry C., Capt., J. A. G. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5913	Liggett, Arthur G., A. C.	California	Em.	Yes.
5914	Osterman, Jacob H., Capt. Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5915	Larson, Westside T., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
5916	Hopping, Andrew D., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
5917	Herendeen, E. D., F. A.	New York	Em.	No.
5918	Longfellow, Newton, A. C.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
5919	Woodward, Fred E., A. C.	Florida	Em.	No.
5920	Barnett, Lloyd, A. C.	California	Em.	No.
5921	Laird, John A., Jr., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
5922	Hoppin, Bushrod, A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5923	Steinmetz, Charles W., A. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
5924	Davies, John M., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5925	White, Wm. N., F. A.	Missouri	Em.	Yes.
5926	Mayer, Walter T., A. C.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5930	Stenseth, Martinus, A. C.	Minnesota	Em.	Yes.
5931	Stoner, Rex K., A. C.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
5932	Carroll, James B., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5933	Rouse, Harold F., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
5934	Gilbert, Thomas L., A. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
5935	DiGens, James D., A. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
5936	DeGruchy, Oliver W., F. D.	New York	Em.	No.
5937	Stetson, Harold D., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
5938	Farnum, Wm. C., A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
5939	Cummings, Charles M., A. C.	Ohio	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
FIRST LIEUTENANTS—continued				
5940	Turnbull, Wm., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5941	Benson, Joseph W., A. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
5942	Lynch, Frederick D., A. S.	Ohio	Em.	No.
5943	Woodruff, James A., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6666	Webster, Wm. W., F. A.	Michigan	MA	No.
7763	Nissley, John K., A. C.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
5947	MacLaughlin, John A., Capt. C. W. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5948	Welsh, Wm. W., A. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
5949	Ennis, Arthur L., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5950	Haynes, Caleb V., A. C.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
5951	Edens, Jean, Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
5952	Kollmer, Emil, F. A.	Indiana	Em.	No.
5953	Yarborough, LeRoy W., Inf.	Washington	Em.	No.
5954	Schlant, Ed. B., Capt. J. A. G. D.	New York	Em.	No.
5955	Stone, Richard F., Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
5956	Ancrum, James N., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
5957	Brier, Wm. W., Jr., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
5958	Franks, John B., Q. M. C.	Kansas	Em.	No.
5959	Turner, John J., F. A.	New York	Em.	No.
5960	Sothern, Richard J., Capt. F. A.	do.	Em.	Yes.
5961	Davis, Orville E., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
5962	McKay, John T., Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	Yes.
5963	Wakeman, Percival A., Sig. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
5964	McElroy, John L., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
5965	Crigger, Herman, J., F. A.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
5966	Gillespie, Floyd T., Sig. C.	California	Em.	No.
5967	Bush, Hal C., Inf.	Michigan	Em.	No.
5968	Martin, Charles H., Cav.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
5969	Speidel, William H., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
5970	Berry, Herbert L., F. A.	do.	Em.	No.
5971	Montgomery, Robert O., F. A.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
5972	Cahill, Martin O., Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
5973	Gibson, Horace N., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
5974	Hogan, James L., C. A. C.	Rhode Island	Em.	No.
5975	Wharton, Sidney F., Inf.	New Mexico	Em.	No.
5976	Bullock, Stephen E., F. A.	New York	Em.	No.
5977	Robinson, Dayton L., Inf.	Mississippi	Em.	Yes.
5978	Pettit, Homer B., C. E.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5979	LeGette, James Y., F. A.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
5980	Willard, Sherman E., C. A. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
5981	Paddock, Howard S., Sig. C.	New York	Em.	No.
5982	Bartron, Harold A., A. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
5983	Miller, John S., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
5984	Sullivan, Joseph A., F. A.	New Hampshire	Em.	No.
5985	McDavid, James B., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
5992	Grable, John C., Sig. C.	California	Em.	No.
5993	Haney, James B., Capt. Ord. Dept.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
5994	McNeil, Guy L., A. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
5995	Carman, James L., Inf.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
5996	Lockett, Landon J., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
5997	Lenow, Columbus B., Inf.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
5998	Calais, Charles H., Inf.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
6001	Calley, Charles D., F. A.	Washington	Em.	Yes.
6002	Siler, Arnold M., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
6003	Jewett, Alfred L., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6004	Bunting, Lloyd D., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6005	Stewart, Elam L., Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
6006	Mallory, Louie C., A. C.	do.	Em.	No.
6007	Childs, Bob, Inf.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
6008	Webster, Lewis S., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6009	Allen, Virgil G., Inf.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6010	Smith, Wm. Ed., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
6011	Smith, William Andrew, Inf.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6012	Camblin, Roy W., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6013	Cavenee, Ray E., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6014	Killen, Wade D., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
6015	Schriever, Andrew J., Jr., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6016	Lawrence, Frank J., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
6021	Hamlin, Winfield S., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6022	Ancker, Clinton J., Inf.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
6023	Stuart, James N., Inf.	California	Em.	Yes.
6024	Sims, Jules V., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
6025	Carlton, Charles, Inf.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
6026	McDonald, Thomas J., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
6027	Clarke, Leo G., Inf.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
6028	Zak, Joseph T., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	Yes.
6029	Dorrien, Hugh C., Inf.	Idaho	Em.	No.
6030	Hurt, Shirley R., F. A.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6031	Horne, James C., Inf.	do.	Em.	No.
6032	Moore, Werner W., Q. M. C.	South Carolina	Em.	Yes.
6033	Hodson, Fremont B., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
6034	Zane, Robert T., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6035	Compton, Irving, Inf.	Colorado	Em.	No.
6036	Broadlow, Rudolph W., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	Yes.
6041	Drewry, Flag A., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	Yes.
6042	Sugg, Oscar D., Inf.	Colorado	Em.	Yes.
6043	Pratt, Milo C., Capt. Q. M. C.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
6044	Pruit, Geo. E., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6045	Walthall, LeRoy A., A. C.	Kansas	Em.	No.
6046	Beau, Lucas V., Jr., A. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6048	Connor, Geo. R., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6049	Farish, Harry S., Capt., F. D.	Virginia	Em.	N.J.
6051	Talbot, Laurence D., Q. M. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
6052	Laughinghouse, Newman R., A. C.	Arkansas	Em.	No.
6056	Tansey, Patrick H., C. E.	Tennessee	MA	No.
6057	Kramer, Hans, C. E.	Michigan	MA	No.
6060	Hewitt, Leland H., C. E.	Iowa	MA	No.
6067	Rice, Keryn, ap., C. E.	New Jersey	MA	No.
6068	Ward, Charles S., C. E.	Idaho	MA	No.
6069	Underwood, Henry M., C. E.	Oklahoma	MA	No.
6073	Lorence, Walter E., C. E.	New Jersey	MA	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
FIRST LIEUTENANTS—continued				
6081	Nixon, Thomas H., Ord. Dept.	Pennsylvania	MA.	No.
6082	Moore, Anderson T. W., C. E.	do	MA.	No.
6085	Alexander, Henry M., Cav.	North Carolina	MA.	No.
6085	Gillespie, James M., A. C.	Maryland	MA.	No.
6095	Bell, Clyde B., Cav.	Tennessee	MA.	No.
6097	Bethel, John M., Cav.	Illinois	MA.	No.
6100	Mesick, John, F. A.	New York	MA.	No.
6102	Weeks, John A., C. A. C.	do	MA.	No.
6105	Sucher, Jacob G., Ord. Dept.	Illinois	MA.	No.
6108	Young, Nevins D., C. A. C.	West Virginia	MA.	No.
6111	Kovarik, Joseph C., Inf.	Kansas	MA.	No.
6115	Rundell, Francis E., Q. M. C.	Illinois	MA.	No.
6116	Machle, Royal A., Inf.	Minnesota	MA.	No.
6121	Mewshaw, Harry C., Cav.	Maryland	MA.	No.
6123	Achatz, Francis J., F. A.	Connecticut	MA.	No.
6124	Kelley, Harold S., Inf.	Maine	MA.	No.
6125	Boineau, Leon C., Inf.	South Carolina	MA.	No.
6126	Gould, Harold W., Inf.	Maine	MA.	No.
6128	Sherman, Harry B., Inf.	New York	MA.	No.
6129	Turner, Frank T., Cav.	Michigan	MA.	No.
6132	Leeper, Carroll K., Inf.	Wyoming	MA.	No.
6134	Wilson, Hugh M., Jr., Inf.	Alabama	MA.	No.
6135	Hazlehurst, Dorr, Inf.	Mississippi	MA.	No.
6137	Kimble, Frederick von H., A. C.	Texas	MA.	No.
6138	Hanlon, William J., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6139	McFall, John H., F. D.	Florida	Em.	No.
6141	Meeden, Barney L., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6142	Stinson, David R., A. C.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
6143	Morris, Joseph T., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6144	Connor, John M., F. D.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
6145	Wald, George, Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	Yes.
6146	Heffley, Arthur S., A. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6147	Lowry, Don E., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
6148	Sweeley, William R., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6150	Brandon, Albert J., Capt., Q. M. C.	Florida	Em.	No.
6152	Hulse, Seward W., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6153	Gamble, Claude L., Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6155	Edwards, Lamuel E., F. D.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
6156	Battle, Joseph F., C. W. S.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6157	Ridenour, Carlyle H., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6158	MacDonald, Russell C., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6159	Meyers, Bennett E., A. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6160	Grimes, George M., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6161	Jackson, Edward B., Inf.	Washington	Em.	No.
6162	Prentiss, Paul H., A. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6163	Heold, Robert S., A. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6164	Maxwell, Warren A., A. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6165	Carlisle, Walter H., C. A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6166	Papenfoth, William H., C. A. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
6167	Hopkins, Frederick M., Jr., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6173	Doherty, John H., F. D.	Rhode Island	Em.	Yes.
6174	Powers, Edward M., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6175	Jennings, Maurice E., C. W. S.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6176	Alexander, Felix M., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6177	Clarke, William B., A. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6178	Harrell, Howell, Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
6179	Burrows, Paul E., A. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6181	Alverson, James L., Capt., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
6183	Gaffney, Dale V., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6185	Heninger, Grant, F. A.	Utah	Em.	Yes.
6186	Powloski, Stanley, Inf.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
6187	Harman, John M., C. E.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6188	Calvin, Harry L., Q. M. C.	Kansas	Em.	No.
6189	Berbert, Henry, C. E.	California	Civ.	No.
6190	Hough, Chester C., C. E.	Virginia	Civ.	No.
6191	Hardy, Conrad P., C. E.	California	Em.	No.
6192	Hunn, Clifford L., Cav.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6193	Craig, Patrick F., C. W. S.	do	Em.	No.
6194	Elmes, Chester H., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6195	Macatee, Edward V., Inf.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6196	Hart, John V., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6197	Browder, Wilbur F., Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6198	Mages, Richard H., A. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6201	Arrowsmith, John C., C. E.	Ohio	Civ.	No.
6202	Foss, George F., Q. M. C.	Maine	Em.	Yes.
6204	Roxbury, Edward J., F. A.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6205	Lamson, Donald D., C. A. C.	Idaho	Em.	No.
6206	Sanders, Augustus D., Inf.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
6207	Morgan, Harvey T., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
6208	Walters, Elsmere J., Q. M. C.	Kansas	Em.	No.
6209	Hagan, Harry E., Q. M. C.	Tennessee	Em.	Yes.
6210	Dewey, Frank O., Cav.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
6211	Taylor, Edward M., F. A.	do	Em.	No.
6212	Balmer, Jesmond D., F. A.	Washington	Em.	No.
6219	Cotton, Charles A., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
6220	Martensstein, Austin W., A. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6222	Ehle, Charles E., Capt., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6223	Corkille, John D., A. C.	Florida	Em.	No.
6224	Mackinnon, Wm. R., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6225	Watkins, Duval C., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6226	Berry, Levi L., A. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6227	Bond, Carlton F., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6228	Conover, Willis C., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
6229	Jones, Morton M., Cav.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
6230	Shaw, Robert M., Sig. C.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
6232	Bailey, John R., Capt., Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6233	Durnford, James A., Q. M. C.	Wyoming	Em.	No.
6234	Anderson, Engmann A., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6235	Marchman, Frank G., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
6236	McKeon, Francis H., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6237	Butler, Braxton D., Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	Yes.
6240	Sheehan, Thomas F., Cav.	Massachusetts	Em.	Yes.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
FIRST LIEUTENANTS—continued				
6241	Marshall, Wm. F., Jr., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
6242	Foster, Thad V., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6243	Cross, Thomas J., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
6244	Haley, James B., F. D.	California	Em.	No.
6245	Kutschke, Emerick, Inf.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
6246	Darby, Marshall E., Ord. Dept.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6248	Gates, John C., Q. M. C.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
6250	McGinnis, Harold A., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6251	Halverson, Harry A., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6253	McKinnon, Morton H., A. C.	do	Em.	No.
6254	Adler, Elmer E., Capt., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6255	Pangburn, Elmer D., Inf.	Washington	Army.	Yes.
6256	Thomas, Nathan W., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6257	Smith, Joseph Evan, Capt., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
6258	Hough, Walter B., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6259	Benson, Guy C., F. A.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
6260	Langman, Wm. M., A. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6263	Burgess, Walter K., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6265	Brooks, Bruno W., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6266	Chapman, Gustavus F., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6267	Dollard, John T., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	Yes.
6268	Brophy, Norman D., A. C.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
6271	Smith, Wallace G., A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6272	Horn, Charles A., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6273	Hill, Plover P., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6274	Wilson, Clarence C., A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6275	Gates, Byron E., A. C.	Montana	Em.	No.
6276	Pettibone, Elmer K., Q. M. C.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
6279	Sharon, Leon E., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6280	Farmer, Clarence R., Inf.	do	Em.	Yes.
6281	Morris, Lawrence B., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6282	Proctor, Ivan L., A. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
6283	Dunton, Delmar H., A. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6284	Carlson, Hjalmar F., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6285	Anderson, Orvil A., A. C.	Utah	Em.	No.
6287	Hood, Robert B., F. A.	Kansas	Civ.	No.
6288	Harris, James J., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6289	Fletcher, Charles F., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6290	Thoroughman, Roy N., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	No.
6291	Downey, Hugh C., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6292	Powers, John J., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6293	Wade, John C., C. E.	Texas	Em.	No.
6294	Goddard, George W., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6295	Reed, Charles W., Ord. Dept.	do	Em.	No.
6296	McCarthy, Wm. J., C. A. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6297	Greer, Jack, A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6298	Kirksey, Guy, A. C.	do	Em.	No.
6299	Chapman, Thomas H., A. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6300	McDonnell, John M., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6301	Mills, Harry H., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
6302	Thomas, Robert V., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6303	Walecka, Joseph L., P. S.	Army.	Em.	Yes.
6305	Dowdall, Harry G., Inf.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6306	Sullivan, Edwin, A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6307	Hutchins, Carroll R., Q. M. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
6308	Drum, John R., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6309	Robbins, Oliver K., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6312	Christian, Frank, P. S.	Army.	Em.	Yes.
6313	Dorcker, Walter L., P. S.	do	Army.	Yes.
6314	Caperton, Roy J., Inf.	do	Em.	Yes.
6315	Haltiwanger, Wilbur N., P. S.	do	Army.	Yes.
6316	Hollister, Paul A., P. S.	do	Army.	Yes.
6318	Wilson, Francis M., P. S.	do	Army.	Yes.
6319	Haynes, Harold M., P. S.	do	Army.	Yes.
6321	Pahlke, John F., Inf.	do	Em.	Yes.
6322	Beehee, Francis C., Capt., F. D.	New York	Em.	No.
6323	Hartrick, Guy R., Capt., O. D.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6324	Glascok, John R., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6325	Graf, Enoch, Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
6326	Van Meter, Isaac D., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6327	Owens, Ray L., A. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
6328	Leinbach, Charles B., F. A.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
6329	Kerah, Henry L., F. A.	Alabama	Em.	No.
6330	Garrison, Lloyd R., F. A.	Texas	Em.	No.
6331	Brenneman, Charles C., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6332	Miller, Raymond C., F. A.	Washington	Em.	No.
6333	Hallam, Clyde M., F. A.	Idaho	Em.	No.
6335	McPike, George V., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6339	Carter, Samuel O., A. C.	do	Em.	No.
6341	Cresney, George G., M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6342	Crumrine, Clarence E., A. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6343	Kirsner, Harry, Q. M. C.	Connecticut	Army.	Yes.
6344	Moran, William K., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6345	Viles, Voler V., Capt., F. D.	Utah	Em.	No.
6346	McDarmont, Corley P., A. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6347	Cooper, Russell H., A. C.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
6348	Phipps, Gaylord L., Inf.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6349	Woodward, Henry G., A. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6350	Moore, Clifford J., Q. M. C.	Louisiana	Em.	Yes.
6351	Morgan, John R., A. C.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
6353	Wriston, Roscoe C., A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6356	Brandhorst, Henry W., Inf.	Colorado	PS.	No.
6357	Smith, Leonard R., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
6358	Partridge, Stanley N., Inf.	do	Em.	No.
6359	Jordan, James B., A. C.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
6360	Caldwell, Albin N., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6361	Monger, Arvel J., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	Yes.
6362	Judd, John H., Inf.	Colorado	Em.	No.
6363	Ford, Thomas J., C. W. S.	Mississippi	PS.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
FIRST LIEUTENANTS—continued				
6364	Smith, Chas. R., Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6365	Shum, Raymond E., Inf.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6366	Cooley, Kenton P., Inf.	Ohio	Em.	No.
6367	Gruber, Lester E., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6368	Smith, Fay, Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6369	Taylor, Alfred N., Inf.	Idaho	Em.	No.
6370	Hardy, William J., Inf.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
6371	Rycroft, Jack E., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
6372	Jacobs, Ben R., Inf.	Montana	Em.	No.
6373	Neff, Marek C., Inf.	Georgia	Em.	No.
6374	Willis, Jefferson B., Inf.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
6375	Hixson, Lewis D., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
6376	Banks, Clyde G., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
6377	Yeaton, Ivan D., F. A.	California	Em.	No.
6378	Winstead, Thomas E., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
6379	Cullins, Harry, Inf.	Kansas	Em.	Yes.
6380	McKenney, Alfred E., Inf.	New Hampshire	Em.	No.
6381	Ellison, Henry B., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
6384	Hayes, Wm. P., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
6400	Dunstan, Edwin V., Capt., Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6401	Kase, John A., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6402	Beque, John H., C. W. S.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6403	Teague, Theodore T., S. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6404	Elder, Eugene V., S. C.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6408	Harris, Ray G., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6409	Reed, Harry E., Inf.	Colorado	Em.	No.
6411	Shively, James C., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6412	Smith-Clifford, Q. M. C.	Illinois	Army.	Yes.
6413	Vanderwerker, Francis H., F. A.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6414	Barnum, Charles V., Cav.	do.	Army.	Yes.
6415	Cluck, James C., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6417	Routhier, Joseph F., F. D.	Illinois	Army.	Yes.
6418	Strode, Robert T., F. A.	Arkansas	Em.	No.
6419	Powell, Russell D., F. A.	California	Em.	No.
6420	Carlson, Charles R., F. A.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
6421	Raymond, Harold C., F. A.	Washington	Em.	No.
6422	Day, Charles H., F. A.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6423	Foreman, Thomas O., F. A.	Louisiana	Em.	No.
6424	Watts, Harry L., Jr., F. A.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6425	Engerud, Harold, Cav.	North Dakota	Em.	No.
6426	Higgins, Raymond T., F. A.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
6427	Page, Sidney C., Cav.	Minnesota	Em.	No.
6428	Caldwell, David D., F. A.	Mississippi	Em.	No.
6429	Wiley, Walter T., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6430	Hastings, Albert J., F. A.	do.	Em.	No.
6438	Knapp, Raymond A., C. A. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6439	Brown, Courtland M., A. C.	do.	Em.	No.
6440	Cherry, Newman H., Q. M. C.	Arkansas	Em.	No.
6441	Tatom, Keith R., Inf.	California	Army.	Yes.
6443	Taylor, Paul R., Inf.	Nebraska	Army.	Yes.
6445	McConnell, Alva E., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6446	McClellan, Hez., A. C.	Louisiana	Em.	No.
6448	Gronnell, James R., P. S.	New York	Army.	Yes.
6449	Marshall, Carley L., Inf.	Army	Army.	Yes.
6450	Huarte, Frank D., P. S.	do.	Army.	Yes.
6451	Jordan, Harold R., P. S.	do.	Army.	Yes.
6453	Allen, Henderson W., P. S.	do.	Army.	Yes.
6455	Davidson, Rufus B., A. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
6457	Williams, Robert S., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6458	Birn, Roland A., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6459	Smith, Stanton T., A. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6460	Stockert, Hubert A., Capt., Q. M. C.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6461	Zeller, Harry L., Q. M. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6463	Freeman, Edward V., Q. M. C.	Massachusetts	Em.	No.
6465	Edmonds, Howard J., P. S.	do.	Civ.	No.
6466	McCullough, Earl T., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
6467	King, Clarence L., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
6468	Abbey, Evers, A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6469	McDaniel, Otto L., F. A.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6467	Kindall, Sylvian G., Inf.	Washington	Em.	No.
6488	Holder, John H., Q. M. C.	South Carolina	Em.	No.
6489	Bailey, Joseph P., A. C.	Alabama	Em.	No.
6492	Salzmann, Rafael L., Inf.	Oregon	Em.	Yes.
6494	Horton, Clarence F., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6495	Woolley, George F., Jr., F. A.	Nebraska	MA.	No.
6496	Jones, Clarence E., Q. M. C.	Dist. of Col.	Em.	No.
6497	Collins, Lawrence C., Inf.	Iowa	Em.	Yes.
6498	Payne, Samuel C., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
6499	Johnson, John J., C. A. C.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6503	Dingeman, Ray E., C. A. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6504	Kuhn, Harry A., C. W. S.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6505	Wilson, Arthur E., C. A. C.	Maine	Em.	No.
6506	Wynne, George C., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6510	North, Thomas F., A.	New Jersey	Em.	No.
6511	Freeman, Robert L., Cav.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
6517	Raezer, John J., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6518	Martin, Pardoe, A. C.	New York	Em.	Yes.
6519	Hunt, John A., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
6520	Brown, Raymond R., A. C.	Florida	Em.	No.
6522	Lickman, Edwin C., Inf.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
6523	Collins, Patrick, Inf.	Pennsylvania	Em.	Yes.
6524	Schmidt, Rudolph G., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6525	Bullock, Frank W., Sig. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6526	French, Ralph W., Q. M. C.	Washington	Em.	No.
6527	Hardee, David L., Inf.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
6529	Monhollan, Joseph E., Inf.	Arizona	Em.	Yes.
6530	Shepard, Whitfield F., Inf.	New York	Em.	No.
6531	Hunt, Clifton T., C. E.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6532	Beine, Helmut E., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
6533	Moore, Robert S., F. D.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
6534	Tagliabue, Aloysius J., F. D.	New York	Em.	No.
6542	Pease, Crowell E., F. A.	Maine	Em.	No.
6543	Avera, Claude B., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
FIRST LIEUTENANTS—continued				
6544	McKiernan, Wm. J. Jr., A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6547	Beer, Arthur W., Capt., J. A. G. D.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6548	Faust, Elden Q., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6549	McBride, Lewis M., Capt., C. W. S.	South Dakota	Em.	No.
6550	Dewey, Arthur E., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6551	McReynolds, Edwin R., A. C.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6552	Lingle, David G., A. C.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6553	Gannon, Michael V., F. A.	Iowa	Em.	No.
6555	Ellis, Harry V., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6555	Webster, Robert M., A. C.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
6558	Spigelmyre, Harold, Q. M. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6559	Fately, Ora E., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
6560	Curtis, Frank H., Inf.	Colorado	Em.	Yes.
6561	Keller, Wm. S., Inf.	Texas	Em.	No.
6562	Christian, Thomas H., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6563	Smith, Paul R., C. W. S.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6564	Essig, Thearl W., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6565	Lindley, Frank B., Inf.	Kansas	Em.	No.
6566	Kolb, Carter M., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6567	Gardyne, Harold A., F. D.	Vermont	Em.	No.
6568	Summa, Grover A., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
6569	Purswell, Sam, Inf.	Alabama	Em.	No.
6570	Rawlins, George J., Cav.	Georgia	Em.	Yes.
6571	Backes, Charles, A. C.	North Dakota	Em.	No.
6572	Nelson, Kent J., Inf.	Indiana	Em.	No.
6573	Canary, Jesse E., Inf.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6574	Opie, Richard E. G., Inf.	California	Em.	No.
6578	Ringer, Elmer C., F. A.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
6579	Landers, Sigmund F., A. C.	Colorado	Em.	No.
6580	Heyduck, Lawrence E., F. A.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6581	Clark, Milo N., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6582	Elwood, Ernest A., F. A.	do.	Em.	No.
6583	Jordan, Lewis P., Inf.	West Virginia	Em.	No.
6588	Mackay, George A., C. W. S.	Washington	Em.	No.
6589	Crocker, Harrison G., A. C.	North Dakota	Em.	No.
6590	Rooks, John M., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6592	O'Connell, Jack J., A. C.	Connecticut	Em.	No.
6593	Frickelton, Frank S., Q. M. C.	California	Em.	No.
6594	Hoas, Ole G., C. E.	do.	Em.	No.
6595	Beard, Robert S., Capt., Q. M. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6596	Decker, Dorey L., Q. M. C.	Ohio	Em.	Yes.
6597	Morris, Ed. J., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6598	Dumont, Fernand G., Inf.	do.	Civ.	No.
6599	Carney, John J., Inf.	Illinois	Em.	Yes.
6601	Matson, Joseph M., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6602	McNeal, Don, S. C.	Ohio	Em.	No.
6606	Robbins, Ed. M., A. C.	California	Em.	No.
6607	Hammond, James W., A. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6608	Felio, Leonard F., Q. M. C.	New York	Em.	No.
6609	Coughlin, Robert E., C. E.	Maryland	Em.	No.
6614	Daw, Wm. J., S. C.	Wisconsin	Em.	Yes.
6615	Ellis, Otto, F. A.	Kansas	Em.	No.
6621	Yoder, Leverett G., C. E.	Wisconsin	MA.	No.
6626	Barnes, Elmer E., C. E.	Rhode Island	MA.	No.
6635	Lock, Edwin P., Jr., C. E.	California	MA.	No.
6645	Twitty, Joseph J., C. E.	Georgia	MA.	No.
6648	Wicks, Roger M., F. A.	New York	MA.	No.
6653	Keyser, George V., F. A.	Indiana	MA.	No.
6659	Callaway, Wm. A., Inf.	Virginia	MA.	No.
6660	Canan, Howard V., C. E.	Nebraska	MA.	No.
6669	Eddy, George G., O. D.	New York	MA.	No.
6673	Hinton, John, F. A.	Missouri	MA.	No.
6676	Ericson, Richard A., C. A. C.	Minnesota	MA.	No.
6683	Gildart, Chas. R., F. A.	Michigan	MA.	No.
6687	Monroe, Hammond M., Inf.	California	MA.	No.
6692	Stice, Kenneth S., Sig. C.	Illinois	MA.	No.
6711	Stansbury, Elmer V., Cav.	New Jersey	MA.	No.
6720	Johnson, Albert W., Cav.	Rhode Island	MA.	No.
6726	Graham, Jesse E., Inf.	Oklahoma	MA.	No.
6727	Lipman, Solomon Mark, Cav.	Nebraska	MA.	No.
6729	Baelig, Eustaquio S., P. S.	Philippines	MA.	No.
6730	Stevens, Burrows G., Inf.	At large	MA.	No.
6734	Gray, Lee E., C. A. C.	Washington	MA.	No.
6738	Moore, Charles H., Jr., Inf.	Arkansas	MA.	No.
6739	Freeman, James W., O. D.	Minnesota	MA.	No.
6740	Mackenzie, Alex. J., Inf.	New Jersey	MA.	No.
6744	Pulsifer, Arthur, Sig. C.	At large	MA.	No.
6748	Gibney, Jesse L., Inf.	Pennsylvania	MA.	No.
6753	Brinumer, Howard W., Inf.	Wyoming	MA.	No.
6761	Bonwell, Miner W., Inf.	Idaho	MA.	No.
6763	Keasler, James L., Inf.	Texas	MA.	No.
6798	Bennison, Richard T., F. A.	New York	MA.	No.
6802	McGill, Francis G., F. A.	Connecticut	MA.	No.
6824	Waddell, Hugh B., Cav.	Mississippi	MA.	No.
6866	Rockafellow, L. Hoyt, Inf.	Pennsylvania	MA.	No.
6879	O'Reilly, Walter T., F. A.	Colorado	MA.	No.
6888	Hopkins, Edward O., F. A.	Oklahoma	MA.	No.
6931	Warren, Joseph H., Inf.	Texas	MA.	No.
6963	Allen, Wm. J., Capt., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6964	Hart, Charles H., Jr., Inf.	Virginia	Em.	No.
6965	McConnell, Adolphus R., A. C.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
6966	Barnes, George D., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6970	Evans, Henry S., Capt., Q. M. C.	Texas	Em.	No.
6971	Fishback, Fred C., A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6973	Hanley, John L., C. A. C.	At large	MA.	No.
6974	Hunsicker, Stanley H., Q. M. C.	Pennsylvania	Em.	No.
6976	Rogers, Oscar L., A. C.	North Carolina	Em.	No.
6977	O'Leary, Roger F., Q. M. C.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
6978	Mills, Samuel P., A. C.	Vermont	Em.	No.
6979	Selzer, Edgar T., A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.

Names of officers who will be retired by the provisions of the War Department appropriation bill as reported to the House—Continued

P. L. 7-1-31	Name and rank	State	Source	Former enlisted service
FIRST LIEUTENANTS—continued				
6980	Lubbe, Albert J., Sig. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
6981	Luscombe, John B., Q. M. C.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
6982	Howard, Charles H., A. C.	Oregon	Em.	No.
6983	Hillery, Edward A., A. C.	Oklahoma	Em.	No.
6987	Powell, Frank E., Q. M. C.	Maryland	Em.	No.
6988	Patrick, Frederick I., A. C.	Missouri	Em.	No.
6989	Goodrich, Donald R., A. C.	Michigan	Em.	No.
6990	Wilson, Ernest W., Capt. F. D.	Kentucky	Em.	No.
6991	Kuhn, Francis H., Q. M. C.	Texas	Civ.	No.
6995	Gunn, Claud T., F. D.	Georgia	Civ.	Yes.
6999	Smith, James Wilson, P. S.	Army	En. N. A.	No.
7000	Harris, Paul A., C. A. C.	Indiana	Civ.	No.
7001	Campbell, Jefferson C., F. A.	Oklahoma	Civ.	No.
7004	Tripp, Richard H., F. D.	Georgia	Civ.	No.
7005	Wells, O. D., Inf.	Pennsylvania	Civ.	No.
7007	Cole, Paul W., C. A. C.	Illinois	MA	No.
7008	Prouty, Everett S., Inf.	Wisconsin	Civ.	No.
7009	Lawrence, Charles S., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Civ.	Yes.
7010	Shaw, John C., Inf.	Kansas	Civ.	No.
7011	Price, William C., Jr., F. A.	Pennsylvania	Civ.	No.
7014	Haddon, Julian B., A. C.	California	Civ.	No.
7015	Collins, Claude D., Inf.	Illinois	Civ.	No.
7016	Burns, William H., C. A. C.	Connecticut	Civ.	No.
7017	Moore, William E., Q. M. C.	do	Civ.	No.
7018	Gunn, Clem O., C. A. C.	Georgia	Civ.	Yes.
7019	Ellis, Wilber R., C. A. C.	Virginia	Civ.	No.
7021	Anderson, George B., C. A. C.	Massachusetts	Civ.	No.
7022	Wolfe, Walter J., C. A. C.	do	Civ.	No.
7024	Watson, Lester F., Q. M. C.	Illinois	Em.	No.
7025	Veequeray, William E., Q. M. C.	Florida	Em.	No.
7026	McCormick, Haynie, A. C.	Texas	Em.	Yes.
7027	Wolf, Arthur H., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
7028	Wilson, Albert T., Inf.	Arkansas	Em.	Yes.
7030	Elder, Hartwell M., Q. M. C.	Georgia	Em.	No.
7031	Holland, Park, A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
7032	Gross, John, F. A.	Kansas	Em.	No.
7033	Howard, Thomas R., Inf.	District of Columbia	Em.	No.
7034	Adams, Samuel J., Inf.	Florida	Em.	Yes.
7035	Kelly, Albert G., Inf.	Tennessee	Em.	No.
7036	Webb, William H., C. A. C.	New York	Em.	No.
7037	Pickles, Wayne M., Q. M. C.	Indiana	Em.	Yes.
7038	Marriott, Owen R., F. A.	Missouri	Em.	No.
7039	Vida, Frank J., Inf.	New York	Em.	Yes.
7228	Sullit, Mariano S., P. S.	Vermont	Em.	No.
7242	Peirce, John B., Inf.	Army	Em.	Yes.
7243	Goodall, James R., C. A. C.	do	Army	No.
7251	Carlsten, Chester A., Inf.	Wisconsin	Em.	No.
7258	Banning, Ed. A., F. A.	Iowa	Civ.	No.
7260	Ingham, Henry L., F. A.	California	Civ.	Yes.
7261	LeStourgeon, Percy E., Inf.	New Jersey	Civ.	No.
7268	Lynch, Harry S., C.	Oregon	Civ.	No.
7270	Lee, Fay W., F. A.	Utah	Em.	No.
7283	Harry, John, C. A. C.	Colorado	Civ.	No.
7312	Langmead, Edmund C., A. C.	Ohio	Army	No.
7315	Haney, Lee W., Inf.	Indiana	Civ.	Yes.
7319	Lepper, Lewis E., W. F. A.	Massachusetts	Civ.	Yes.
7328	Love, Henry L., F. A.	Utah	Civ.	No.
7338	Walsh, Edward J., Inf.	Maryland	Civ.	No.
7351	Baker, John J., Inf.	Army	Army	No.
7353	Johnston, Robert B., Q. M. C.	South Carolina	Civ.	No.
7357	Phillips, Donald B., A. C.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
7358	Robertson, Wm. W., Inf.	New Jersey	Civ.	No.
7361	Adams, Hugh P., F. A.	Ohio	Civ.	Yes.
7363	Moore, Thomas E., F. A.	Colorado	Civ.	No.
7367	Merrick, Louis M., A. C.	District of Columbia	Civ.	No.
7368	Woods, Lee R., Jr., F. A.	Oregon	Civ.	No.
7370	Watkins, Dudley W., A. C.	Wyoming	Civ.	No.
7371	Willis, Arthur N., Cav.	Vermont	Civ.	No.
7374	Ferguson, Homer W., A. C.	Oregon	Civ.	No.
7378	Sevilla, Pacifico C., P. S.	Philippine Islands	Civ.	No.
7380	Delaney, John C., C. A. C.	Maryland	Civ.	No.
7384	Evans, Andrew J., Inf.	South Carolina	Civ.	No.
7386	Ashton, Donald M., Inf.	Massachusetts	Civ.	No.
7404	Catalan, Nemesio, P. S.	Philippine Islands	Civ.	No.
7503	Dickie, James H., F. D.	Wisconsin	Civ.	Yes.
7510	Watters, William E., F. A.	South Dakota	Civ.	No.
7511	Dawson, Leo H., A. C.	Colorado	Civ.	No.
7512	Smith, Milton J., A. C.	California	Civ.	No.
7514	Hilliard, Leonard L., Inf.	Texas	Civ.	Yes.
7517	Irwin, Carlisle B., Inf.	Army	Army	No.
7522	Vance, Lee C., Cav.	do	Army	No.
7533	Perry, Russell V., Q. M. C.	do	Army	No.
7539	Clouser, Edward B., Inf.	Delaware	Civ.	No.
7783	Anderson, Herbert W., A. C.	Montana	Civ.	No.

RECAPITULATION

The following recapitulation will show the number of officers that will be retired from each State:

Promotion list officers to be retired by location of appointment	
Alabama	16
Arizona	10
Arkansas	16
California	131
Colorado	27

LXXV—619

Connecticut	22
Delaware	6
District of Columbia	94
Florida	31
Georgia	44
Idaho	11
Illinois	123
Indiana	58
Iowa	38
Kansas	30
Kentucky	47
Louisiana	14
Maine	19
Maryland	42
Massachusetts	65
Michigan	47
Minnesota	40
Mississippi	22
Missouri	57
Montana	4
Nebraska	12
Nevada	1
New Hampshire	3
New Jersey	51
New Mexico	4
New York	177
North Carolina	30
North Dakota	7
Ohio	75
Oklahoma	22
Oregon	37
Pennsylvania	108
Rhode Island	13
South Carolina	24
South Dakota	6
Tennessee	42
Texas	95
Utah	16
Vermont	13
Virginia	55
Washington	46
West Virginia	19
Wisconsin	28
Wyoming	9

Source from which appointed

	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major	Captain	First lieutenant
Military Academy	31	20	28		63
Volunteer	42	18			
Civil	1	5	72		60
Army	8	54	27	13	29
Emergency	3	2	117	615	517
Former enlisted service	2	10	52	273	188

MERGER OF PUBLIC UTILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, a member of this committee, wanted to be present if they were going to call up the merger resolution. The gentleman from Texas is opposed to it and the Federated Citizens' Associations here are against the joint resolution. If this joint resolution is going to be called up now we ought to have a quorum to get the membership here, and I shall be compelled to make a point of no quorum to let the Members know the joint resolution is coming up.

I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Abernethy	Carley	Dickstein	Golder
Aldrich	Cary	Dies	Goldsborough
Andrews, N. Y.	Caviechia	Dieterich	Hall, Miss.
Bachmann	Celler	Douglas, Ariz.	Hartley
Beck	Chapman	Douglass, Mass.	Haugen
Bland	Chase	Doutrich	Hawley
Bloom	Clarke, N. Y.	Drane	Hess
Boland	Collier	Eaton, N. J.	Hogg, Ind.
Bolton	Connolly	Erk	Hogg, W. Va.
Boylan	Cooper, Ohio	Estep	Hopkins
Britten	Corning	Fish	Honor
Brumm	Crosser	Foss	Horr
Brunner	Cullen	Freeman	Houston
Bulwinkle	Curry	Fulmer	Igoe
Burch	Darrow	Gasque	Jeffers
Canfield	Davenport	Gavagan	Jenkins
	De Priest	Gifford	Johnson, III.

Johnson, Tex.	Lindsay	Ramseyer	Strong, Pa.
Kahn	Lovette	Ransley	Sweeney
Kendall	McDuffie	Reid, Ill.	Taber
Kennedy	McLaughlin	Romjue	Taylor, Colo.
Kerr	Maas	Rudd	Taylor, Tenn.
Knutson	Mead	Sabath	Thurston
Kopp	Moore, Ohio	Sanders, N. Y.	Tinkham
Kurtz	Mouser	Schuetz	Tucker
Lambeth	Murphy	Seger	Underwood
Lamneck	Nelson, Wis.	Shott	Warren
Lankford, Va.	Oliver, N. Y.	Sirovich	Watson
Larrabee	Owen	Smith, Idaho	Welsh, Pa.
Lea	Patman	Stalker	White
Leavitt	Perkins	Stevenson	Wigglesworth
Lewis	Purnell	Stokes	Wood, Ind.

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and one Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

On motion of Mrs. NORTON, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FRATERNAL INSURANCE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27), and yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. HARLAN, to offer an amendment thereto.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, on the last day given over to District business, House Joint Resolution 154, providing for a merger of the street-railway systems in the District of Columbia, was the unfinished business. As this joint resolution was the unfinished business when the District Committee last had the call, is it not the unfinished business when the House resumes consideration of District business?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not, because a motion to consider it is necessary. Wherever a motion is required, the unfinished business has no precedence over any other business.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a concurrent resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 27

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President of the United States in signing the enrolled bill (S. 3584) to require all insurance corporations formed under the provisions of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia to maintain their principal offices and places of business within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, be, and the same is hereby rescinded, and that the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reenroll the bill with the following amendment in the nature of a correction, viz: On page 1, line 11, of the engrossed House amendment, after the word "corporation," insert the following: "kept in a branch-office agency of such corporation."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the lady from New Jersey is not calling up the merger resolution?

Mr. HARLAN. This is a concurrent resolution to correct a bill that has already passed the House and the Senate.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the expression "to correct a bill" sounds simple, but may be very far reaching in its effect. As I heard the concurrent resolution read, it provides for an amendment with respect to a branch-office agency. How does that change the original bill as it was passed?

Mr. HARLAN. The original bill required all insurance companies incorporated in the District of Columbia to keep their main office in the District of Columbia and to keep their books here for examination, except agency books. When the bill was engrossed, in some way they left out the exception.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. In other words, it does not change the bill as passed, but changes an incorrectly engrossed bill.

Mr. HARLAN. That is the purpose of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer at this time an amendment to the concurrent resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 11, after the word "following," strike out the word "amendment" and substitute the word "amendments," and on page 1, line 12, strike out the words "a correction" and insert the word "corrections," and at the end of the resolution strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the following:

And on page 1, line 12 of the engrossed House resolution, after the word "agency," insert the following:

"And provided further, That any insurance corporation created by special act of Congress is hereby authorized upon resolution of its board of directors or trustees to reincorporate under the laws of any State of the United States, a certified copy of such resolution of such board of directors or trustees having first been filed in the office of the superintendent of insurance of the District of Columbia and recorded in the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia. Upon compliance with the above conditions the assets of the said corporation shall thereby become vested in the new corporation. Said new corporation shall faithfully carry out any and every right, obligation, and liability of said original corporation."

Mr. BLANTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Unless it were done last Saturday, until there has been a motion made and passed, or unanimous consent given, vacating the provisions by which this bill was passed and sent to the Senate, can it be taken up now?

The SPEAKER. That was done on Saturday last. This is a concurrent resolution authorizing the engrossing clerk to engross the bill with certain provisions in it.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MERGER OF STREET-RAILWAY CORPORATIONS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 154) to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia and for other purposes.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the reading of the preamble, which is all that is left of the joint resolution to be read, the gentleman from Texas be given 10 minutes and I be given 10 minutes to discuss the joint resolution generally.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the preamble.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, the preamble being familiar to all the Members of the House and being of some length, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read.

Mr. STAFFORD. The preamble being a necessary part of the joint resolution, I shall have to object.

The Clerk read the preamble, as follows:

That pursuant to the act entitled "An act to permit the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1925, a form of agreement to carry this into effect and providing for the formation of a new corporation to be known as the Capital Transit Co. to acquire properties and/or stocks or securities, and to succeed to the powers and obligations of the Capital Traction Co. and to succeed to the powers and obligations of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. directly connected with or relating to the operation of electric railways, motor busses, and/or other forms of public transportation, having been approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia on the 7th of December, 1931, as follows:

UNIFICATION AGREEMENT

Whereas the act entitled "An act to permit the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1925, provides "that any or all of the street-railway companies operating in the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to merge or consolidate, either by purchase or lease by one company of the properties, and/or stocks or securities of

any of the others, or by the formation of a new corporation to acquire the properties and/or stocks or securities and to succeed to the powers and obligations of each or any of said companies under such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by vote of a majority in amount of the stock of the respective corporation, and as may be approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That no merger of said companies shall be finally consummated until the same is approved by a joint resolution of Congress. Such new corporation shall be incorporated under the provisions of Subchapter IV, Chapter XVIII, of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, as far as applicable, with issues of stock at a stated par value and/or of no par value, as may be approved by the Public Utilities Commission; and

Whereas the Washington Railway & Electric Co. (hereinafter referred to as the "Washington Co.") and the Capital Traction Co. (hereinafter referred to as the "Capital Co."), street-railway companies now operating in the District of Columbia, are organized in accordance with special acts of the Congress of the United States for the purpose of carrying on street railway and other business; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable, for the purpose of greater efficiency and economy of management and for the benefit and advantage of the public and of the stockholders of said companies, that their transit properties used in the business of street railway, motor bus, and/or other forms of public transportation within the District of Columbia or between the District of Columbia and adjacent States, and such other property and assets, real and personal, tangible and intangible, as may be described in this agreement shall be placed under unified ownership and operation; and

Whereas the premises, covenants, agreements, grants, terms, and conditions herein have been approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia:

Now, therefore, if and when the said premises, covenants, grants, terms, and conditions herein contained are agreed upon by a vote of a majority in amount of the stock of the respective corporations, their respective properties as hereinafter described shall be transferred to and vested in the new company and the mode of carrying the same into effect shall be as follows:

First. The name of the new company shall be Capital Transit Co. (hereinafter referred to as the "new company").

Second. The new company shall be incorporated under the provisions of Subchapter IV of Chapter XVIII of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia and pursuant to an act of Congress entitled "An act to permit the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1925, with power to acquire, construct, own, and operate directly or through subsidiaries transit properties within the District of Columbia and in adjacent States, including the power to acquire, own, and operate the properties of whatsoever description to be conveyed to the new company in accordance with this agreement, and to acquire and own the stock and/or bonds of said companies and of any other company or companies engaged in the transportation of passengers in the District of Columbia and adjacent States with the power to mortgage its property, rights, and franchises, and to conduct such other activities as may be useful or necessary in connection with or incident to the foregoing purposes, including the power to buy, sell, hold, own, and convey real estate within and without the District of Columbia. Said new company when incorporated shall become and remain subject in all respects to regulation by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia or its successors to the extent of the jurisdiction vested in it or them by law over corporations engaged in the transportation of passengers within the District of Columbia. Nothing either hereinbefore or hereinafter in this agreement shall be construed as changing or limiting the provisions of any law with respect to corporations engaged in the transportation of passengers.

Third. The board of directors of the new company shall consist of 15 persons. Of the 15 original directors, 7 shall be nominated by the Washington Co., 7 by the Capital Co., and 1, to hold office for two years, shall be agreed upon by the 14 nominated as above. Of the directors so to be initially nominated by the Capital Co., 5 shall hold office for 3 years and 2 shall hold office for 2 years. Of the directors so to be initially nominated by the Washington Co., 2 shall hold office for 2 years and 5 shall hold office for 1 year.

The directors shall be stockholders and a majority bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, and shall, except as hereinbefore provided, be elected annually by the stockholders at such time and place as shall be determined by the by-laws of the company. The officers of the new company shall be selected by the board of directors.

Fourth. The new company shall have such rules, regulations, and by-laws as the directors shall adopt not contrary to its charter or to the laws in force in the District of Columbia. The duties and powers of the directors and the duties and powers of the officers of the company shall be such as are set forth in the by-laws.

Fifth. The authorized number and par value of the shares of stock of the new company, the number of shares of stock to be issued originally for the purpose of the unification and in payment for the properties of the Capital Co. and the Washington Co. to be acquired hereunder, the bonded indebtedness of the new company, the division of the stock issued by the new company between the Washington Co. and the Capital Co. shall all be as approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District

of Columbia: *Provided*, That the original bonded indebtedness and stock liability of the new company shall not be in excess of the total amount of the stocks, certificates of stock, bonds, or other evidences of indebtedness then outstanding against the Capital Co. and the Washington Co.

Sixth. After the original issue of stock for the purposes of the unification additional shares of stock and/or additional bonds or other evidences of indebtedness may, subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, be issued by the directors from time to time for cash or in payment for bonds, or property, or to reimburse the treasury for capital expenditures.

Seventh. Approval of this agreement by joint resolution or act of Congress of the United States shall constitute and confer jurisdiction on the Public Utilities Commission to issue any order reasonably necessary to secure the operating and/or other economies contemplated by this merger. And said orders shall have the same legal effect and be enforceable in the same manner as other orders of said commission.

Eighth. Upon the organization of the new company the following transactions shall be carried out substantially simultaneously:

A. The Capital Co. shall vest in the new company all of its current assets, all moneys or securities of every form owned by it, whether held as cash, securities, choses in action, or special funds of any nature, all of its estates, lands, rights, powers, privileges, licenses, franchises and properties; real and personal, tangible and intangible, of every kind (including without limiting the generality of the foregoing, 202 shares of the par value of \$50 per share of the capital stock of the Washington & Maryland Railroad Co. out of a total of 202 shares issued and outstanding, \$68,000 principal amount of 6 per cent bonds of said company, due January 15, 1947, and a demand note for the principal amount of \$20,500 bearing interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum made by said company indorsed to the Capital Co.), and shall transfer to the new company all existing operating and other contracts and/or rights (subject to all conditions of said contracts) and shall execute all deeds, assignments, and/or other conveyances requisite for such purpose.

In consideration thereof the new company shall—

(a) Issue to the Capital Co. such shares of its capital stock and/or other securities as may be agreed upon by the Capital & Washington Co. and approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

(b) Assume and discharge as the same mature all of the liabilities of the Capital Co., such liabilities to be \$5,800,000 principal amount of Capital Traction first mortgage bonds bearing interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum, due June 1, 1947 (in addition to \$200,000 principal amount thereof now in the treasury of the Capital Co. which shall be canceled on or before the date of closing hereunder), and current liabilities arising in normal conduct of the business.

It is understood and agreed that to carry out the intent thereof the Capital Co. shall and will as soon as may be possible after the date of closing as hereinafter defined, make distribution to its stockholders, liquidate and dissolve, and that to this end approval of this agreement by joint resolution or act of the Congress of the United States shall constitute and confer all necessary authority to the Capital Co. to liquidate its assets by distributing amongst its stockholders, in proportion to their several holdings of stock in said company, the shares of stock of the new company which it shall have received as the consideration for the sale, transfer, and conveyance of its property to the said new company as provided herein, and thereupon to liquidate its affairs and dissolve its corporate existence: *Provided*, That the existing liabilities of the said Capital Co. and the rights of its creditors shall not be affected thereby, and that such creditors shall have, as to the new company upon the transfer of property to it as aforesaid, all rights and remedies which they may then have as to the Capital Co.: *And provided further*, That no action or proceedings to which the Capital Co. is a party shall abate in consequence thereof, but the same may be continued in the name of the party by or against which the same was begun, unless the court in which said action or proceedings are pending shall order the new company to be substituted in its place and stead: *And provided further*, That the fact of such dissolution in accordance with this provision shall be published once a week for two successive weeks thereafter in at least two daily newspapers of general circulation published in the city of Washington, D. C.

The date of closing is hereby defined as the date of the transfer of the properties mentioned herein to the new company and the delivery of new company shares to the Capital and Washington Cos. in accordance herewith.

B. The Washington Co. will vest or cause to be vested in the new company all of its physical property, real and personal, Glen Echo Amusement Park (except devices now owned by the Washington Co. or Glen Echo Park Co.), tracks, lands, buildings, shops, structures, machinery, rolling stock, busses, easements, franchises, rights, operating and other contracts for the use of tracks, power, exchange of facilities, or otherwise, directly connected with or relating to and used in the ordinary operation and business of an electric railway, motor bus, public transportation company and common carrier, situate in the District of Columbia and State of Maryland (subject to all conditions of said contracts), including without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the physical property, rights, and franchises of the Washington & Rockville Railway Co. of Montgomery County

used in the operation of said transit business, with the understanding, however, that nothing herein shall be understood to include the transfer of the right of the Washington Co. and the Washington & Rockville Railway Co. of Montgomery County to exist as corporations or separate corporate entities, nor to include the stock of the Potomac Electric Power Co., the Braddock Light & Power Co. (Inc.), Great Falls Power Co., Potomac Electric Appliance Co., or other investments in stock, bonds, or personal property not connected with or used in the ordinary conduct of the business of said electric railways, nor any cash, bills receivable, credits, or choses in action, except as otherwise herein provided (and that approval of this agreement by joint resolution or act of the Congress of the United States shall constitute and confer the necessary authority to the Washington Co. to retain and hold the aforesaid stocks of the said companies). A general description of the property to be transferred hereunder shall be prepared and delivered to the Capital Co. before the final execution of deeds, and the Washington Co. shall execute all deeds, assignments, and/or other conveyances requisite for such purpose. It being understood, however, that the Washington Co. will transfer to the new company net current assets equal to the net current assets transferred to the new company by the Capital Co., as hereinbefore provided, and no more.

The said property of the Washington Co. shall be vested in the new company, subject in so far but only in so far, as the same may by terms of such mortgages, respectively, attach to any part or parts of said property, to the following mortgages or deeds of trust:

(1) First mortgage of the City and Suburban Railway of Washington, dated September 1, 1893, made to the Baltimore Trust & Guaranty Co., as trustee.

(2) First mortgage of the Anacostia & Potomac River Railroad Co., dated April 1, 1899, made to the Baltimore Trust & Guaranty Co., as trustee.

(3) Consolidated mortgage of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., dated March 1, 1902, made to United States Mortgage & Trust Co., as trustee.

In consideration thereof the new company shall issue to the Washington Co. such shares of its capital stock and/or other securities as may be agreed upon by the Capital and Washington Cos. and approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, and shall assume such of the above-described bonds as may be approved by the Public Utilities Commission, and in addition shall assume and discharge, as the same mature, liabilities of the Washington Co. incident to the transit business to be transferred as aforesaid.

Out of the total net current assets received by the new company there shall be set aside a reserve in an amount sufficient in the opinion of the Public Utilities Commission to liquidate all claims for injuries and damages against the Washington Co. and the Capital Co. on account of operations prior to the date of closing: *Provided*, That any excess or deficit in such reserve remaining after the final liquidation of such claims for injuries and damages shall be credited or debited, respectively, to the surplus of the new company.

The new company is authorized to acquire any or all of the outstanding stock of the Washington Rapid Transit Co. (the bus company) on such terms as may be accepted by the owners of said shares of stock and may be approved by the Public Utilities Commission; if and when a majority of the outstanding shares of the said Washington Rapid Transit Co. is acquired by the new company, the Washington Rapid Transit Co. shall be merged or consolidated with the new company when and if the Public Utilities Commission shall so require.

Ninth. The foregoing is based on the present conditions and business of the participating companies and on the assumption that, in the interval before the consummation of the foregoing transactions, there will be no change in the transit businesses, other than as a result of normal operations or necessary to meet changed operating conditions, and that no distribution will be made to the stockholders of Capital Co., except the regular dividend payments, at not exceeding 7 per cent per annum, and that, subject to such exceptions, the assets and liabilities of the participating companies will be substantially as appears from their balance sheets, as of the 31st of December, 1931, subject to variations in the normal course of business.

Tenth. The new company shall take over all existing contracts of the Washington Co. for the sale of power to other railway companies. The Washington Co. will cause the Potomac Electric Power Co., subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission, to enter into a power contract with the new company (which may include a lease by the power company of the power properties which the new company will have obtained as being appurtenant to the transit properties to be acquired by the new company), which said power contract shall run for the life of whichever of the franchises of these two companies expires first, and be effective as of the date of closing of said contract. Said power contract shall provide that the Potomac Electric Power Co., or its successors and assigns, will, at all times on request, furnish an adequate supply of electric power for the maintenance and operation of the transit properties of the new company and for power furnished to said other transportation companies. Said power contract shall provide that for a period of 15 years the price to be paid by the new company (1) for 63 per cent of the electric power used for the maintenance and operation of the transit properties of the new company and (2) for electric power furnished to other transportation companies under the existing contracts and/or renewals

thereof shall be determined in accordance with the terms and conditions of the present arrangements between the Potomac Electric Power Co. and the Washington Co. for supply of electric power. After the expiration of said period of 15 years the price to be paid for said 63 per cent of the electric power shall be subject to review and determination by the Public Utilities Commission, and shall be made upon the basis herein above provided for the 15-year period, unless and until otherwise ordered by said commission. The price to be paid for 37 per cent of the electric power used for the maintenance and operation of the transit properties of the new company shall be fixed by the Public Utilities Commission and be subject to review and determination annually by that commission.

Eleventh. The Washington Co. shall remain subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Commission. Any sinking funds now held by it shall remain available for the discharge of securities for which it remains liable and which are secured directly or indirectly by any lien upon property turned over to the new company.

Twelfth. Any and all rights with regard to valuations and/or rate bases now possessed by any of the parties to this agreement shall not be prejudiced hereby, and shall be enjoyed by the new company until a valuation of the properties of the company shall be fixed as now or hereafter provided by law: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall deprive the new company of any rights under the Constitution of the United States.

Thirteenth. The new company shall grant with each street-railway fare a free immediate transfer to any connecting portion of its street-railway lines within the District of Columbia, subject to reasonable rules and regulations to prevent abuse thereof. In addition, transfers between street cars and busses and between bus lines shall be granted under reasonable terms and conditions. The rules, regulations, terms, and conditions upon which all transfers shall be issued shall be subject to the approval of the Public Utilities Commission.

Fourteenth. This agreement is conditioned upon the new company being relieved from the expense of policemen at street railway crossings and intersections, the laying of new pavement, the making of permanent improvements, renewals or repairs to the pavement of streets and public bridges; and the permanent improvements, renewals, or repairs to public bridges over which the street-car lines operate; except that the new company shall bear the entire cost of paving repairs or replacements incident to track repairs, replacements, or changes made at a time when the street or bridge is not being paved, and shall bear one-fourth the cost of other paving, repaving, or maintenance of paving between its tracks and for 2 feet outside of the outer rails, and shall bear the excess cost of construction and maintenance of public bridges, due to the installation or existence of its tracks on such bridges, but nothing herein shall relieve the new company from liability for street paving as owner of real estate apart from rights of way occupied by its tracks, as set out in the so-called Borland law, approved September 1, 1916, as amended to date, and/or in an act to provide for special assessments for the paving of roadways and the laying of curbs and gutters, approved February 20, 1931.

Fifteenth. Legislation obtained to effectuate this agreement shall contain a provision that no competitive transportation line shall be established without the prior issuance of a certificate by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to the effect that the competitive line is necessary for the convenience of the public.

Sixteenth. The new company may defray any legal and other expenses of unification which may be necessarily incurred in connection therewith; provided that these expenses shall be treated in the accounts of the new company as ordered by the Public Utilities Commission.

Seventeenth. The new company upon opening its books of account shall set up reserves, special accounts, and deferred charges equal to the combined reserves, depreciation funds, special accounts, and deferred charges of the Capital and Washington Cos. in so far as they relate to depreciation of properties turned over to the new company or to liabilities assumed by it, other than the reserve for injuries and damages as heretofore provided in section 8. Such reserves, or accounts, shall be set up in such manner that there shall be continuity of accounting between the books of the Capital and Washington Cos. and the new company: *Provided*, That the new company shall not be required to maintain any depreciation fund if it sets up a reserve against depreciation at rates fixed therefor by the Public Utilities Commission, but may use money and/or securities in any depreciation fund turned over to it in any manner approved by the Public Utilities Commission. Nothing herein provided shall be construed as changing or limiting the jurisdiction of said commission over depreciation accounts of any of said companies.

Eighteenth. Approval of this agreement by the Public Utilities Commission or Congress shall not be taken as approval of the considerations mentioned herein for properties or stocks, nor as binding upon the Public Utilities Commission in any future determination of the fair value of the properties used and useful for the public convenience belonging to the Washington Co., the Capital Co., or to be acquired by the new company, that may be made in accordance with this agreement.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the word "that" and insert the word "whereas."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, by unanimous consent the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] and I were granted 10 minutes each.

The CHAIRMAN. We are now considering the committee amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. That was the purpose of getting recognition, to have time before the committee amendments were adopted.

Mr. BLACK. My understanding was that the time granted to the gentleman from Texas and myself was after the committee amendments were adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas for 10 minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I am just as strongly and heartily in favor of a proper merger of the railway companies in Washington as any person in the District of Columbia. For 15 years I have been working with every energy that was in my being trying to bring that about. Not to bring about a merger that would give something to the railway companies that they ought not to have; not to bring about a merger that would take something away from the people of the District of Columbia, but to bring about a just merger that would give something to the people of the District of Columbia that I think they should now have.

The following appeared in the Washington Star yesterday:

FEDERATION RAPS CAR-MERGER VOTE—OPPOSES COMMITTEE REPORT ON TRANSIT BILL—UPHOLDS CAPPER VIEWS

The Federation of Citizens' Associations at its monthly meeting last night unanimously adopted a report of its committee on public utilities favoring the Capper minority report on the street-car merger bill and opposing the report made to the House by the House District Committee.

When this question came up last District day—April 25—if gentlemen will get the RECORD, they will see that when I raised some objection to the bill the distinguished chairman of the committee, on page 9161, said that the bill was approved by every organization in Washington.

This bill has been in Congress for about 30 years. This is the first year that everybody seems to agree that this is a good bill. * * * As far as I know, everybody in the District, except the gentleman from Texas, agrees that this is a very good bill.

And she said that the people of the District recommended it. I challenged that statement at that time and stated from the floor that, in my judgment, among the 450,000 people who lived in Washington at least 400,000 of them would be against the joint resolution if they understood it was up for passage and if they understood its contents.

What has happened since then? Let me read you a letter that I received this morning. It comes from a pretty authentic source. It is from the Federation of Citizens' Associations of Washington. That is a federation of every association of citizens in this great national city.

The letterhead is "Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia." The officers are George C. Havenner, president, and all of us know Mr. Havenner and his standing here; George E. Sullivan, vice president, and we all know Mr. Sullivan; A. H. Gregory, treasurer; David Babp, secretary, and H. C. Phillips, corresponding secretary, and we know their standing here. The letter is dated Washington, D. C., May 9, 1932, which is to-day, and it is addressed to myself. It says:

In re: Street railway merger bill (S. J. Res. 13)—

I do not know whether the people of Washington are superstitious or not, but I would not want the number 13 attached to any measure that is going to take \$500,000 away from the citizens here every year. The letter says:

My DEAR SIR: I have been instructed to forward you a copy of the report of the Committee on Public Utilities relating to the above matter, which was adopted by the Federation of Citizens Associations of the District of Columbia at a meeting held May 7, 1932, as follows:

"The Committee on Public Utilities supports and indorses the street railway merger bill, S. J. Res. 13, as reported to the Senate by the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments proposed to said bill by Senator CAPPER and Senator BLAINE in a minority report submitted to the Senate on S. J. Res. 13. The committee opposes the bill as reported to the

House of Representatives by the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Hoping the above will receive your consideration, I remain, Very truly yours,

DAVID BABP, Secretary.

I have asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] and I have asked the chairman of the committee if they would not put these proposed safeguarding Capper amendments upon this joint resolution which would safeguard the rights of the people. They said no, that they were going to pass it just as it is.

Mr. THATCHER. What, in substance, are the amendments?

Mr. BLANTON. They are too numerous to mention in my few minutes. In nearly every city of the United States where the people's rights are protected, and where the great utility corporations are not in power, the railway companies are required to pave between their tracks. That is just. They are tearing up old construction to clean their tunnels all the time, and if the city had to do it for them, it would be a tremendous expense.

That is a just charge upon the street-railway companies. They, not the people here, ought to pay it.

In their charters, which provide that neither one of these railway companies ever shall charge over a 5-cent fare, although by a favorable and friendly Utilities Commission they are permitted to charge 10 cents, it was provided that they must pave between their tracks. They are getting rid of much of that now by this bill. It is putting a burden that, in my judgment, will amount to \$200,000 a year upon the backs of the people of the District of Columbia, and it is relieving these corporations of that just burden. It is not right, it is not just, it is inequitable, and it ought not to be allowed in this House.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I had only 10 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK] can yield to the gentleman. He is one of the new members on this committee, and comes from the great State of New York and the great city of New York, where lives the North American Co., that practically owns and controls the stocks of both of these companies—a company that came down here and tried to put over that \$50,000 razzle-dazzle on Mr. GILBERT and Mr. GIBSON and myself, but did not succeed. I do not blame the gentleman from New York for being heartily in favor of this joint resolution. Constituents of his up there are putting this thing over.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. What else does this do to the citizens of Washington?

Mr. BLANTON. It shifts at least \$500,000 per annum from the railways to the backs of the people here. I know if the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] understood all that I know about this joint resolution, she would not stand for it for a minute. I ask all United States Senators to read the facts against this joint resolution, which I placed in the RECORD of April 25, 1932, on pages 8885 to 8890.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mrs. NORTON. The lady from New Jersey would say that all the argument she has heard from the gentleman from Texas would indicate that he is the only one who has all of the honesty in connection with this joint resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. All right. Let us see about that. My friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who is a member of the lady's committee, said that he is strongly opposed to this joint resolution. He had to be called away because of some important engagements with constituents this morning and could not be back here until 2 o'clock. I urged the lady from New Jersey to put this joint resolution off until 2 o'clock, so that Mr. PATMAN could come here and be heard and give his reasons for voting against the joint resolution, but she would not do it.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I can not yield further. The gentleman will have to get his time from the gentleman from New

York [Mr. BLACK], the gentleman who represents the city where lives the great North American Co.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am sorry, my very limited time does not permit it, for I want to put my views before the committee and I have only a few minutes left. I do not know how all of the Democrats feel about Senator CAPPER of Kansas, but I have worked with him. He is a little more, what would you call it—I would call it something that might reflect on LA GUARDIA, of New York, and SCHAFER, of Wisconsin, and since they would rather I would put it "progressive," I will say that he is a little less conservative than I am, but Senator CAPPER is a good man, he is a strong man, and his judgment on this matter is sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas will refrain from mentioning Senators by names.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas two minutes of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Thank you very much. Now, I am not talking about anybody whom I ought not talk about. I am talking about a good fellow by the name of CAPPER. He is a good fellow. I have worked with him. He has got some pretty good ideas and some pretty good judgment, and he is going to fix this joint resolution in proper shape when the time comes for taking it up in the Senate. He is going to fix it before it ever reaches the White House, to safeguard the rights of the people. Many of you would not vote for this joint resolution if you did not believe that it would be safeguarded in the Senate. But this joint resolution may pass the House, and a parliamentary situation may arise where CAPPER and BLAINES could not be present and could not get the proper amendments to the joint resolution. It ought to be taken care of here before it is ever passed in this House. It does not do one thing on God's earth for the people of Washington except give them interchangeable transfer tickets. And it costs them \$500,000 additional per year.

Mr. McLEOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I do not have time to yield.

It does not give the people one other thing of value. It does not promise any reduction of fare. By this joint resolution you are taking off the shoulders of the street railway companies here, in my judgment, \$500,000 a year, and putting it on the backs of the people of Washington. Are you willing to do that?

My idea is that this is a half-cooked, half-baked piece of legislation. For the first time since I have been here, the action on the passage of a bill had to be stopped to read a preamble; and we are going to pass the preamble as a part of the joint resolution. In the whole history of Congress I have never heard of that. When, before, have we ever passed the preamble to a resolution? We have always stricken it out.

This is a half-cooked, half-baked, half-understood, dangerous piece of legislation that ought to go back to the committee and rest a while until our friend, Mr. CAPPER, and his helpers can iron out the situation, because he understands it better than any other man in Washington. Are you not willing to do that? Who could be hurt by it? Why not send it back to the committee? I shall make a motion to recommit if somebody else does not do it. I hope that my progressive friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], will do it, but if he does not do it, I will.

Since April 25 I have received almost a goods box full of letters from leading citizens of Washington saying, "For God's sake, do not let that bill pass. We do not want it. We never dreamed there was such a bill before the Congress." I have shifted the responsibility from my shoulders to yours. It is up to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas two minutes of my time, because I did not want to leave him and Senator CAPPER hanging in the air. I did not know how high they would go.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has manifest advantages to the city of Washington. There is a demand for this bill. Every organization in the city has wanted a merger of the street-railway systems, because they understood the absurdity of having a dual railway system, with all of its expense and lack of connection. The Senate went so far as to employ a noted expert, Mr. Maltbie, and this is practically his plan. For years we have been attempting to pass a merger bill through the House. We have gotten as far with this joint resolution as we have ever gotten with any merger bill. This joint resolution will immediately give the people of Washington free transfers from car line to car line, something they have not previously had. It will provide for economies in the operation of the two companies that will permit the two companies to give the people of Washington better service and better equipment. More than that, it will enable these two street-car lines to live; to keep up their employment personnel. There is danger, with this competition and this extravagance from the so-called competition, that very soon one of these lines will have to go out of business, with the eventual failure of pay roll and service. It is in the interest of the unemployed to pass, and pass as quickly as possible.

Mr. McLEOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I yield.

Mr. McLEOD. I would like to read to the gentleman from New York from the report to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 208, which bill was drafted practically identical with that of Mr. Maltbie's proposition. Mr. Maltbie is the gentleman who has been referred to as one of the greatest transportation experts of the United States. Senator CAPPER in his report said:

Favorable action on the joint resolution during the present session of Congress is important not only to give early effect to the benefits the public will derive from unified operation of the transportation facilities of the District, but because the unification agreement or contract entered into by the companies involved expires by limitation on June 1, 1929.

Further, this great expert, Mr. Maltbie, who has been referred to, referring to a bill that is practically identical, said:

As a result a joint resolution has been prepared for adoption as indicating the general principle and the specific terms and conditions which should be complied with before the unification of the transportation lines is effective.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, we have reported this bill itself from the District Committee. We have amended the bill in certain particulars. We have acted on the actual legal portions of this joint resolution. We have just now read the preamble. The preamble is the proposed agreement between the companies. It has been approved by the Public Utilities Commission. On that preamble the joint resolution itself hangs. The first section of the bill approves that contract. There is nothing now before the committee except the preamble.

As I say, two weeks ago the House gave very serious thought to every portion of the merger proposition.

Every gentleman, including the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], had an opportunity to come on the floor and offer amendments. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is a member of the District of Columbia Committee. He had his opportunity there to cure this joint resolution if he did not like it. I did not desire to be discourteous to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], but I did not think it fair to the House or to the people of Washington to postpone this joint resolution awaiting the convenience of one gentleman. I am sorry I could not do it.

I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have an unusual situation when it comes to the question of the city of Washington and this particular merger. I have had some experience with public utilities. I have been the mayor of a fairly decent-sized city and know something about conditions surrounding a municipality.

There is no other city in the United States that enjoys as fair light rates as the District of Columbia. People in the District of Columbia are now paying 3.9. There are

no industries in Washington. The power company here must depend upon the sale of its power to these public utilities. Once these go out of commission, and there are none other in existence, the Potomac Power Co., I can assure you, will never be able to manufacture power at as fair rates as it is doing to-day. It is able to manufacture its power at such a fair rate because it has this outlet where it can dispose of a great volume of its power.

I realize you can not continue to go along as you have been doing, namely, having two separate companies, because your mode of transportation is entirely different. If one of these organizations fails it, is going to be to the detriment of the riding public of Washington.

I have given this very careful consideration, and I believe it is in the interest of the car riders of the District of Columbia. I believe this merger should be approved by this House and by approving it I think we are taking a step in the right direction. It will make conditions far better for the car riders of Washington and make it far better for the people who are doing business in this community.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed further I ask unanimous consent to amend the preamble on page 19, line 15, by striking out the words "one-fourth" and inserting the words "one-half." I do this in order to make the preamble correspond with the amendment adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment, page 1, line 3, before the word "pursuant," insert the word "Whereas."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Page 2, line 4, after the words "operation of," strike out the words "electric railways, motor busses, and/or other forms of public," and insert the words "street railway and bus."

Page 2, line 6, strike out the word "having" and insert the word "has," and in line 8 strike out the words "on the 7th of December, 1931, as follows:"

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee amendment. I observe that this amendment is a part of the first paragraph of the preamble, which reads as follows, with the amendment already adopted:

Whereas pursuant to the act entitled "An act to permit the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1925, a form of agreement to carry this into effect and providing for the formation of a new corporation to be known as the Capital Transit Co., to acquire properties—

And so on—

has been approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

I rise to fortify that recital in the preamble by asking members of the committee whether that is a recital of fact, namely, that the agreement recited in this preamble has been actually approved by the Public Utilities Commission.

Mr. BLACK. I will answer the gentleman. The bill came to us in the regular course from the Public Utilities Commission. It was sent to the Speaker and the Speaker sent it to the committee, and General Patrick appeared before the committee in support of the bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Ordinarily I would be much impressed by such a resolution as that presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], coming from organizations in the District. However, I understand that resolution comes not from these organizations themselves but from some of the delegates of those organizations who take issue with the Public Utilities Commission. So far as the Congress of the United States is concerned, it seems to me that in matters of this kind we must act upon the recommendations of those arms of the Government which have been formed in the District. We have established a Public Utilities Commission in the District of Columbia. It is a servant

of the Congress of the United States in the discharge of its duties, and, as a matter of fact, it would be impossible for us, Mr. Chairman, as members of the Committee of the Whole or of the House to go into all of the details and all of the niceties relating to a matter of contract, such as this legislation must be essentially.

We all know that if we could compel the merger of these companies by direct act we probably would insert in the law conditions which are not possible of adoption here. We know that these companies have rights which have been granted them by the Congress in past years by previous legislation, and now that these companies, pursuant to a resolution passed by the Congress itself, have entered into an agreement for a merger, which agreement has been approved by the Public Utilities Commission of the District, our own creature, it seems to me we may rely upon the nature of the agreement thus made, and those of us, who do not have the opportunity, that other Members of the House perhaps have had, to study in detail the matters involved in the proposed legislation, must rely upon the action of the constituted authorities which we ourselves have created for the purpose of securing a merger of these companies which, after all, is exceedingly desirable.

We all know by our own experience that we have these two competing traction lines running side by side and we can not even get a transfer from one of them to the other in obtaining transportation within the District of Columbia.

Street-car transportation is suffering like railroad transportation from competition with bus lines and private automobiles. This condition exists generally throughout the country and quite acutely in the District of Columbia. The present is a good time to adjust transportation facilities in our municipalities. The opportunity for stock jobbing is practically nonexistent. The need for employment through extensions of lines and services is at its height. Any impulse or encouragement that can properly be given to business at this time should be welcome. As I understand it, the pending bill is based not only on legislation already existing but also on contractual obligations and relations heretofore established, and therefore not subject to change by law, unless Congress should attempt to abrogate the terms of contracts now in force. So far as Congress has any power over any portion of the subject matter, that power is retained by the last section of the bill, which reads:

That Congress reserves the power to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution.

The future control of the matter by Congress is, therefore, preserved as fully as it now exists. Of course, any legislation that may be passed must take into consideration existing rights and obligations of the corporations involved. That is done by this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, answering the remarks of my friend from Illinois, this statement does come from the Federation of Citizens Associations. It recites that they appointed a special utilities committee from the federation to investigate this bill; that the special committee on utilities that they appointed reported back to the federation their opposition to it for various reasons; that there was a meeting of the Federation of Citizens Associations here in Washington on May 7, which was day before yesterday, and they passed their resolution against this bill and asked the House not to pass it. This objection, therefore, comes from the citizens of Washington 100 per cent.

Let me call your attention to another thing. I have taken the floor many times to show that you can not depend on the present Utilities Commission. First, they have tried to run out every independent 20-cent taxi and give the business to this Parmalee Co., that has come in here to run these independent taxis, driven by ex-service men, off the streets of Washington. Twelve hundred of these men fought in France, and are running these taxis to make a living for their wives and children. General Patrick

has sought to run them out of business, and he is the man who brought this bill here.

They talk about the Pepco, the Potomac Electric Power Co. Did you know that the bill you are passing provides that for 15 years no power or authority can change an agreement that the Potomac Electric Power Co. has to furnish 60 per cent of the power at a certain price? Why is there such a provision in this bill? It is outrageous. Why should there not be a provision that the amount these companies shall pay the Pepco for power shall be regulated justly and properly in the courts? Why are you taking away the authority of the courts to pass upon and regulate this for 15 years with respect to 60 per cent of the power? It is outrageous. Do you think if you or I were on that Public Utilities Commission we would have sent a bill to Congress with any such outlandish provision in it? Certainly, we would not. It is outrageous.

Now, I have done my duty. I have gone to the trouble of looking these facts up for you. I have gone to the trouble of showing that you can not go on the market today and buy \$1 of stock in the Washington Electric Railway Co. You can not buy a dollar's worth of stock in Pepco to-day. They will not sell it to you. If they are such poor-paying businesses, why do they not want to sell their stock?

I have called your attention to these things and I have done my duty. It is going to be up to you to vote away the rights of the people of Washington, who through their Federation of Citizens Associations have asked you not to pass this measure. If you do it, the responsibility is on you and not on me. I have done my duty by the people and I have done my duty by the Government.

I work hard and I have tried to bring the facts before you. Now, what are you going to do about it? Are you going to just pass this bill haphazardly? You will not hurt this bill if you delay it. I am for a proper merger just the same as you are, and you will not hurt the measure by sending it back to the committee and letting the Capper amendments be properly prepared and ironed out. This will not hurt anybody, and I guarantee that a proper bill will be ready to be taken up soon, safeguarding in every way the rights of the people, that we can all vote for it, and it will be a measure that will do justice to everybody.

I am going to make a motion to recommit at the proper time. Let us send it back to the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the preamble do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 1, strike out the words "street railway, motor bus, and/or other forms of public" and insert "street railway and bus."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following amendments:

Page 2, line 8, after the word "Columbia," strike out the words "on the 7th of December, 1931, as follows."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 5, line 14, after the word "passengers," insert "by street railway or bus."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 6, line 2, after the word "passengers," insert "by street railway or bus."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 6, line 20, after the word "and," strike out "a majority" and insert "at least nine of them."

The amendment was agreed to.

Page 20, line 6, strike out the word "transportation" and insert "street railway or bus."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 154, to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on all amendments on the bill and amendments to final passage, and the preamble.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to, and the amendments to the preamble were agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the joint resolution be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLANTON moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were 25 ayes and 62 noes.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The yea-and-nay vote is automatic.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 100, nays 192, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—100

Allgood	Fulbright	Kniffin	Polk
Amle	Fulmer	Kvale	Ramspeck
Arnold	Gibson	LaGuardia	Rankin
Ayres	Gilchrist	Lankford, Ga.	Robinson
Blanton	Glover	Leavitt	Sandlin
Boileau	Green	Ludlow	Schafer
Brand, Ga.	Greenwood	McClintic, Okla.	Schneider
Briggs	Griswold	McGugin	Selvig
Butler	Guyer	McLaughlin	Simmons
Campbell, Iowa	Hall, Ill.	McSwain	Sinclair
Carter, Wyo.	Hancock, N. C.	Maas	Snow
Christgau	Hart	Magrady	Sparks
Cochran, Mo.	Hill, Ala.	Miller	Steagall
Collins	Hill, Wash.	Milligan	Summers, Wash.
Crall	Hogg, Ind.	Mobley	Swank
Crisp	Howard	Nelson, Mo.	Swing
Cross	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Tarver
Dies	James	Nolan	Taylor, Colo.
Dowell	Johnson, Mo.	Norton, Nebr.	Thurston
Dyer	Johnson, Okla.	Oliver, Ala.	Weeks
Ellzey	Johnson, Tex.	Parks	Withrow
Evans, Calif.	Jones	Patterson	Wolcott
Finley	Kading	Peavey	Wood, Ind.
Frear	Keller	Person	Woodruff
French	Ketcham	Pittenger	Wright

NAYS—192

Adkins	Andrew, Mass.	Barbour	Bohn
Aldrich	Arentz	Barton	Bolton
Allen	Auf der Heide	Beedy	Bowman
Almon	Bacon	Black	Britten
Andresen	Bankhead	Boehne	Browning

Brumm	Fishburne	Loneragan	Rich
Burdick	Fitzpatrick	Loofbourov	Rogers, Mass.
Burness	Flannagan	Lozier	Rogers, N. H.
Byrns	Free	Luce	Seiberling
Cable	Fuller	McClintock, Ohio	Shallenberger
Campbell, Pa.	Gambrill	McCormack	Shannon
Cannon	Garber	McFadden	Shreve
Carden	Gasque	McKeown	Smith, Idaho
Carter, Calif.	Gilbert	McLeod	Smith, Va.
Cartwright	Goodwin	McMillan	Snell
Cary	Goss	McReynolds	Somers, N. Y.
Chindblom	Granfield	Major	Spence
Chipfield	Gregory	Maloney	Stafford
Christopherson	Griffin	Manlove	Stewart
Clague	Hadley	Mapes	Stull
Clancy	Haines	Martin, Mass.	Sutphin
Clark, N. C.	Hall, Miss.	Martin, Oreg.	Swanson
Cochran, Pa.	Hall, N. Dak.	Michener	Swick
Cole, Iowa	Hancock, N. Y.	Millard	Temple
Cole, Md.	Hardy	Mitchell	Thatcher
Colton	Harlan	Montague	Thomason
Condon	Hastings	Montet	Tierney
Connerly	Hoch	Moore, Ky.	Tilson
Cooke	Holaday	Mouser	Timberlake
Cooper, Tenn.	Hollister	Nelson, Me.	Treadway
Cox	Holmes	Niedringhaus	Turpin
Coyle	Hooper	Norton, N. J.	Vinson, Ga.
Crowther	Hope	O'Connor	Vinson, Ky.
Culkin	Houston, Del.	Overton	Wason
Dallinger	Hull, William E.	Palmisano	Watson
Davis	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker, Ga.	Weaver
Delaney	Kelly, Ill.	Parker, N. Y.	Welch, Calif.
Dickinson	Kelly, Pa.	Parsons	West
Dominick	Kemp	Partridge	Whitley
Doughton	Kinzer	Pettengill	Whittington
Douglas, Mass.	Kleberg	Pou	Williams, Mo.
Eaton, Colo.	Kopp	Prall	Williamson
Englebright	Kunz	Pratt, Ruth	Wingo
Erk	Lambertson	Purnell	Wood, Ga.
Eslick	Lanham	Rainey	Woodrum
Evans, Mont.	Larsen	Rayburn	Wyant
Fernandez	Lichtenwalner	Reed, N. Y.	Yates
Fiesinger	Linthicum	Reilly	Yon

NOT VOTING—140

Abernethy	Darrow	Jacobsen	Ransley
Andrews, N. Y.	Davenport	Jeffers	Reld, Ill.
Bacharach	De Priest	Jenkins	Romjue
Bachmann	DeRouen	Johnson, Ill.	Rudd
Baldrige	Dickstein	Johnson, Wash.	Sabath
Beam	Dieterich	Kahn	Sanders, N. Y.
Beck	Disney	Karch	Sanders, Tex.
Bland	Douglas, Ariz.	Kendall	Schuetz
Bloom	Doutrich	Kennedy	Seger
Boland	Doxey	Kerr	Shott
Boylan	Drane	Knutson	Shovich
Brand, Ohio	Drewry	Kurtz	Smith, W. Va.
Brunner	Driver	Lambeth	Stalker
Buchanan	Eaton, N. J.	Lamneck	Stevenson
Buckbee	Estep	Lankford, Va.	Stokes
Bulwinkle	Fish	Larrabee	Strong, Kans.
Burch	Foss	Lehibach	Strong, Pa.
Busby	Freeman	Lewis	Sullivan, N. Y.
Canfield	Garrett	Lindsay	Sullivan, Pa.
Carley	Gavagan	Lovette	Summers, Tex.
Cavicchia	Gifford	McDuffie	Sweeney
Celler	Gillen	Mansfield	Taber
Chapman	Golder	May	Taylor, Tenn.
Chase	Goldsborough	Mead	Tinkham
Chavez	Hare	Moore, Ohio	Tucker
Clarke, N. Y.	Hartley	Morehead	Underhill
Collier	Haugen	Murphy	Underwood
Connolly	Hawley	Oliver, N. Y.	Warren
Cooper, Ohio	Hess	Owen	Welsh, Pa.
Corning	Hogg, W. Va.	Patman	White
Crosser	Hopkins	Perkins	Wigglesworth
Crowe	Hornor	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Williams, Tex.
Crump	Horr	Ragon	Willson
Cullen	Hull, Morton D.	Ramseyer	Wolfenden
Curry	Igoe		Wolverton

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Hare (for) with Mr. Underhill (against).

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Darrow.
Mr. Stevenson with Mr. Murphy.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Clarke of New York.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Eaton of New Jersey.
Mr. Boylan with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Williams of Texas with Mr. Perkins.
Mr. Collier with Mr. Wolverton.
Mr. Lindsay with Mr. Jenkins.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Baldrige.
Mr. McDuffie with Mr. Hopkins.
Mr. Mead with Mr. Connolly.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Horr.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Ransley.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Foss.
Mr. Rudd with Mr. Hawley.
Mr. Beam with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Stokes.
Mr. Jacobson with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Bloom with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Bacharach.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Kendall.
Mr. Patman with Mr. Buckbee.
Mr. Tucker with Mr. Taylor of Tennessee.
Mr. Igoe with Mr. De Priest.
Mr. Warren with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
Mr. Garrett with Mr. Lehlbach.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Moore of Ohio.
Mr. Ragon with Mr. White.
Mr. Wilson with Mr. Curry.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Beck.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Cavicchia.
Mr. Lewis with Mr. Freeman.
Mr. Karch with Mr. Golder.
Mr. Sullivan of New York with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Sanders of Texas with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Bachmann.
Mr. Crump with Mr. Lankford of Virginia.
Mr. May with Mr. Strong of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Crowe with Mr. Shott.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Morehead with Mr. Ramseyer.
Mr. Dieterich with Mr. Estep.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Pratt.
Mr. Brunner with Mr. Strong of Kansas.
Mr. Driver with Mr. Haugen.
Mr. Chavez with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Stalker.
Mr. Oliver of New York with Mr. Sanders of New York.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Lovette.
Mr. Douglas of Arizona with Mr. Doutrich.
Mrs. Owen with Mr. Davenport.
Mr. Drane with Mr. Chase.
Mr. Jeffers with Mr. Hogg of West Virginia.
Mr. Carley with Mr. Kurtz.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Brand of Ohio.
Mr. Abernethy with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Morton D. Hull.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Hornor with Mr. Goldsborough.
Mr. Busby with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Gillen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REDUCTION OF NUMBER OF OFFICERS IN THE ARMY

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by printing a letter addressed to me this morning by General MacArthur, Chief of Staff.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following letter addressed to me by the Chief of Staff of the United States Army:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1932.

Hon. BERTRAND H. SNELL,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNELL: In the hearings held by the Military Subcommittee on Appropriations on the Army appropriation bill no indication was given to the representatives of the War Department that a reduction of 2,000 officers was contemplated, and in consequence no opportunity has been afforded to express the opinion of the department on such a revolutionary step. As the military adviser of the Government, I am therefore taking the liberty of presenting to you the views of the General Staff on this important matter, with the hope that you will lay them before the House.

Skilled officers, like all other professional men, are products of continuous and laborious study, training, and experience. There is no short cut to the peculiar type of knowledge and ability they must possess. Trained officers constitute the most vitally essential element in modern war, and the only one that under no circumstances can be improvised or extemporized.

An army can live on short rations, it can be insufficiently clothed and housed, it can even be poorly armed and equipped, but in action it is doomed to destruction without the trained and adequate leadership of officers. An efficient and sufficient corps of officers means the difference between victory and defeat.

It is for these reasons and because of the further fact that the success of the American system of preparedness is peculiarly dependent upon the continued existence of an adequate corps of professional officers that the War Department views with the utmost concern the proposal in the Army appropriation bill to

reduce permanently by more than 16 per cent the number of Regular Army officers.

Prior to 1920 there existed in the world only two general systems under which military forces were organized and maintained. The basis of one was the conscript; of the other, it was the professionalized soldier. The former afforded the maximum of defense with the minimum of cost, but prescribed as a civic duty service with the colors. The latter depended exclusively upon the enrollment of those who adopted the military as a professional career. It entailed abnormal costs, due to the necessity of reimbursing along professional lines the personnel involved. For this reason no nation has been able in modern times to maintain a professional army of sufficient size to insure complete protection.

In the national defense act of 1920 a new type of military system was devised and established. Through it, for the first time in American history, practical success was attained in adjusting military preparation to our national needs. Every essential provision of that act exemplifies this Nation's purely defensive intent. It conforms to the American tradition of permitting in time of peace only voluntary service in our armed forces and of placing ultimate responsibility for defense upon a citizen soldiery. Finally, it gives assurance of reasonable security at moderate cost.

The principal elements of the American system are two. The first is a small professional force to act as a training cadre—a covering force in case of need, and a framework upon which mobilization of our full force could be effected. The second essential element is a partially developed organization of citizen soldiers divided into a National Guard and various classifications of reserve and other groupments, backed by a continuous program of limited military training for these elements in time of peace.

Our small Regular Army would be impotent, through its own unaided efforts, to defend this Nation against powerful and sustained attack. Likewise an unorganized and untrained population would be tragically helpless in the face of highly organized and trained units. The two parts of the system thus articulate with and complement each other to insure that America's enormous latent strength would not be dissipated through hostile action before it could be harnessed into a powerful military machine.

The Regular Army is the bulwark and basis of the whole structure. It is the instructor, the model, and, in emergency, the leader of the whole. The only continuing body in which reside the professional knowledge and technical skill capable of accumulating, organizing, training, and leading to victory a national army of citizen soldiers is the professional officer corps. Constantly they concern themselves with the mobilization plans for personnel and matériel necessary in a great emergency, and make every practicable prearrangement for the successful operation of these plans should need arise.

Commissioned personnel of the citizen components supplements the corps of regulars, they give generously and patriotically of their time and effort in peace so that, as the numerically preponderant mass of the officers in an emergency army, they may function promptly and effectively. But their devotion and their efforts in this preparation would be wasted without the efficient guidance of their mentor—the regular officer. Through schools, study, research, and practical training the regulars devote their lives to keeping abreast of the times in complicated and rapidly changing arts and sciences, and within the limits imposed by available opportunity impart the results to the officers of the citizen components.

So I repeat that in the last analysis our whole defensive system rests upon the efficient performance of a corps of regular officers sufficient in strength to carry out the vitally essential duties imposed upon it by the act of 1920. In the interests of economy the strength of the professional force was fixed at the minimum considered by Congress in 1920 to be consistent with safety—namely, 18,000 officers and 285,000 enlisted men. During the past decade this strength has been progressively decreased until to-day it stands at approximately 12,000 officers and 125,000 men.

With a vivid realization of the need for rigid economy in public expenditures the War Department budget for 1933 sacrifices everything in excess of bare necessities. The sums requested represent the minimum upon which the Military Establishment may exist for a single year rather than the true requirements of national defense. The department insists that any retrenchment which destroys or seriously damages a vital element of our already weakened defensive structure is not economy but extravagance of the most expensive kind.

The War Department has frequently reported to Congress that the minimum peace strength of the Regular Army at which it can carry out the missions assigned by the national defense act, and make a reasonable preparation for a complete and immediate mobilization for the national defense in the event of national emergency declared by Congress, is 14,063 officers and 165,000 enlisted men. Repeated studies by the War Department confirm the accuracy of these figures. The expedients to which the War Department is necessarily put in order that the missions of the Regular Army assigned by the national defense act may be even approached with the reduced officers and enlisted men appropriated for in recent years can be appreciated only by those who have to carry this grave responsibility.

It appears superfluous to point out again that the United States has achieved a relative degree of land disarmament unique among the great powers of the earth. By no improvisation could our system be adapted suddenly to offensive purposes, because it deliberately contemplates a delay of several months between the

declaration of emergency and the time when any considerable force could take the field. Among the armies of the world the American ranks sixteenth in strength, although this Nation ranks fourth in population and first in wealth.

Further reductions would bring us close to prostration—a condition not conducive to the promotion of a feeling of security at home nor to enhancing the respect with which our pacific counsels are received abroad.

Very sincerely,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General, Chief of Staff.

CONFERRING ON CERTAIN PERSONS PRIVILEGES OF SOLDIERS' HOMES (H. DOC. NO. 315)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read.

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning without approval H. R. 4724, entitled "An act to confer to certain persons who served in the Quartermaster Corps or under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General during the war with Spain, the Philippine insurrection, or the China relief expedition the benefits of hospitalization and the privileges of the soldiers' homes."

This bill is identical with H. R. 6997, Seventy-first Congress, third session, from which I withheld approval for the reasons set forth in my message to the House of Representatives, of February 23, 1931, printed as House Document No. 778. Nothing has transpired since that date which would justify me in now approving this bill.

I can not concur in a proposal to single out one class of civilian employees who served during certain periods of hostilities and confer upon them a right to the benefit of hospitalization and domiciliary care provided by law for veterans of our wars. Such proposal would be establishing a precedent which, in all justice, would call for similar legislation in behalf of other civilians. It would ultimately involve the Government in hundreds of millions of expenditures by the usual accretions of wider spread inclusions of new and borderland groups. I am not unmindful of the value of the service rendered by these civilian components, but I do not feel that they should be made beneficiaries of the laws which have been enacted to care for our veterans—those who served under enlistments, enrollments, or commissions in the Army and Navy. Our first obligation is to these veterans and we should certainly not now reduce the availability of the hospital and home facilities which have been provided for them by throwing such facilities open to civilians.

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 9, 1932.

The SPEAKER. The message from the President will be spread upon the Journal.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message be referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered printed. The motion was agreed to.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PARKER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the District Committee for yielding to me at this time. I would not infringe on the committee's time if I had not found it impossible to get time in any other manner. In this connection, I am wondering if there is not something wrong with the system that permits the same Members to come here daily and talk at length on every subject under high Heaven except the pending legislation and at the same time excludes those Members who have intelligent statements to make with reference to the bill. I shall not attempt to make a political speech nor will I open my campaign for reelection to Congress at this time.

I wish to address myself to the War Department appropriations bill that is pending before the House in so far as it pertains to a reduction of officer personnel of the Army. If I did not personally know the gentlemen who wrote this bill, I might be led to believe that it was advocated and sponsored by ignorant individuals who know nothing of the

Army and its functions. However, since I do know these estimable gentlemen, I shall attribute their fanciful and unsound views to misinformation that they have gained from some unknown source.

Having had years of experience in the Army, I feel that I am qualified and privileged to speak on this subject with some degree of authority. In addition to discussing the cut in officer personnel of the Army as a whole, I feel it my duty to warn this Congress as to the effects of the provision of the bill that will practically wipe out the Judge Advocate General's Corps, which I had the honor to be a member of for nearly four years.

I was driven from the Army myself in 1922 because of discriminatory legislation that Congress had enacted in reorganizing the Army after the World War. It was then a question of age, as it will be now if the provisions of this bill are made the law of the land.

In 1917, when I volunteered my services, I was 32 years of age, too old to receive a provisional appointment in the Army, the age limit for such appointments being at that time 28. In 1920, when the Army was reorganized, I was 35, too young to hold the rank I had earned, the minimum age limit placed on emergency officers taken into the Regular Establishment with the rank of major having been fixed by Congress at 36.

If I were still in the service at this time, I would be 47 in September, again too old to serve as a captain. I would, if I had not already eliminated myself in 1922, have to be eliminated under the terms of this proposed legislation.

Now, let us approach this matter intelligently and fairly. What will be the results of the decrease to 10,000 in the number of officers of the Army?

The Army appropriation bill proposes to reduce the commissioned strength of the Army to 10,000, made up as follows:

Promotion list officers.....	8,930
Nonpromotion list officers.....	1,070

Total authorized strength.....	10,000
--------------------------------	--------

Based on the estimated strength as of July 1, 1932, this will require reductions as follows:

Promotion list officers.....	1,814
Nonpromotion list officers.....	356

Total reduction.....	2,170
----------------------	-------

The selection of the officers to accomplish this reduction is confined to those most advanced in age in each grade, with a provision that 5 per cent of such older officers in each grade may be retained and younger officers selected in lieu thereof.

Any reduction is inimical to our national defense. Fourteen thousand and sixty-three officers is the minimum required to enable the Regular Army reasonably to carry out its mission prescribed by Congress in the national defense act. Due to appropriation limitations the annual average has been kept down to 12,000, with a consequent shortage of officers with many of the Army's most important functions.

A reduction as now proposed necessarily will result in a drastic curtailment of Army activities in training the civilian components, National Guard, Organized Reserves, and Reserve Officers Training Corps.

Such a reduction will make it impossible to maintain the small, balanced, mobile force so necessary for emergencies.

It will make it impossible to man, even in part, our essential seacoast defenses.

It will not permit the Army to provide anything approaching adequate garrisons for our overseas possessions.

Even with the present strength the shortage of officers with troop units is a matter of grave concern.

The Army school system would be wrecked. The World War demonstrated the necessity of these schools for the training of officers. Just as trained officers are keystones in national defense, the schools are keystones in the officer's training.

The saving reported by the committee, which exceeds the War Department estimate, amounts to less than 3 per cent of the amount expended for pay of the Army. In comparison with the damage to national defense which would result, such a saving is triflingly insignificant. From the

standpoint of national defense it is manifestly a penny-wise and pound-foolish proposition.

In normal times such a reduction would be serious enough, but in the present state of world affairs it well might result in a national catastrophe. Literally to hamstring national defense as such a reduction would do is a responsibility thinking men and women will hesitate to assume.

Realizing the extreme danger to our country of effecting an economy by reducing the Army, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House [Mr. BYRNS] on April 5, 1932, at a hearing before the Economy Committee, made the following statement to the Secretary of War, Mr. Hurley:

It does seem to me that a man like yourself, who is a real business man, as secretary of national defense, could make considerable saving, not by reducing the Army personnel, because I do not want to see that done; not by reducing the Navy, because I have always stood for preparedness; but in the administrative cost.

A drastic contraction of Medical Department activities necessarily would result. Those pertaining to the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps will have to be practically abandoned, and the care of veterans will, of necessity, be greatly curtailed.

Finally, due to the necessary drastic curtailments of many essential activities, the provisions of and the policies laid down by the national defense act would be practically nullified, the morale of the Army personnel would be shattered, and our national defense dealt a staggering blow.

The method proposed for the selection of the officers to accomplish the reduction is even more astounding than the reduction itself. With the 5 per cent leeway, the selection must be based on age alone.

Such a plan is purely arbitrary and has nothing to recommend it.

Relative professional or physical fitness is excluded from consideration.

Individual efficiency as demonstrated by records of service is pushed out of the picture.

A large percentage (many times greater than 5 per cent) of the best-trained, most-efficient officers of the widest experience in the Army would be forced out.

The interests of the Government are in no way conserved by this arbitrary method.

If there must be a reduction, the yardstick of efficiency is the only sound basis for selection.

In the event of any reduction the Government has a right to retain the most efficient officers, and the interests of national defense demand their retention.

Many colonels of the ability, efficiency, and experience for selection as general officers would be ruthlessly plucked on the eve of achieving the culmination of a successful military career.

Likewise, high-ranking officers in the other grades would be forced out just prior to promotion to a grade where they would be among the youngest officers in the grade, while less efficient officers would be retained.

This age-alone method takes no account of the special technical and professional requirements of the different branches of the Army, with the result that certain branches, e. g., the Quartermaster Corps, the finance department, and the Judge Advocate General's department would lose considerably more than 50 per cent of their personnel.

The statement in the committee's report that this reduction would serve to correct unfortunate promotion conditions has no basis in fact, is misleading, and absolutely incorrect except as to the limited acceleration due to the small reduction on May 31, 1933, to make room for the 1933 West Point class.

To the contrary, the removal of the 2,000 older officers would so delay and diminish retirements for age, a potent source of attrition, as to retard materially rather than accelerate promotion.

Entire classes of the Military Academy will be forced out under this method. The great majority of the officers affected are in the prime of their usefulness, far removed from normal retirement.

A striking injustice would be done World War officers who entered the Army in 1920. The national defense act (June 4, 1920), under the provisions of which these officers came into the Army, provided the following minimum-age requirements for appointment in grades, as follows:

	Years
Colonel.....	48
Lieutenant colonel.....	45
Major.....	36

Forced by act of Congress to be of such age in 1920 before they could enter the Army, they now of necessity, by the mere passage of time, are among those who would be forced out by act of Congress. It is inconceivable that the Congress will permit such an injustice to be consummated.

Present calculations under this age-alone method show that every officer appointed in 1920 in the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major of necessity will be included in the group who are forced out.

Contrary to the committee's report, practically none of these officers are receiving the higher pay rates for their grades. Many of them receive as much as \$150 per month less than younger officers in the same grade who will be retained.

It is apparent that the age-alone method does not provide the maximum saving.

Among those affected by this age-alone method would be many distinguished officers of both Spanish-American and World War service, including numerous recipients of the medal of honor, distinguished-service cross, distinguished-service medal, and silver-star citation for gallantry in action. The 5 per cent leeway is far from sufficient to take care of them.

The inference in the committee's report that this age-alone method is in accord with the recommendation of the Interdepartmental Pay Personnel Board is decidedly misleading and inaccurate. This board's report in its entirety clearly shows they recommended that any compulsory removals should be made solely upon the basis of efficiency, with a view to retaining those officers who are of greatest value to the service.

Retrenchment that cripples national defense is not economy. Everything in war and for war can be improvised except the trained officer. An efficient and sufficient corps of officers spells the difference between victory and defeat.

Skilled officers, like all other professional men, are the result of continuous and laborious study, training, and experience. There is no short cut to the peculiar type of knowledge they must possess.

To deplete our already inadequate corps of officers would be a most serious blow to our national defense; to accomplish such depletion by forcing out skilled officers due to age alone would be unsound in principle, unfair and unjust both to the officers and to their country—an extravagance rather than an economy.

The provisions on pages 10 to 12 of the War Department appropriation bill for 1933 contemplate a reduction in the commissioned strength of the Army to 10,000.

The bill provides that after September 30, 1932, the funds appropriated for pay of officers shall not be used for the pay of more than 10,000 active officers, and that after the same date the number of promotion-list officers (including general officers of the line and colonels) shall not exceed 8,930. The distribution of these promotion-list officers in grade as proposed by the bill and the reduction made in the authorized strength of each grade are shown below:

Grade	Now authorized	Authorized by bill	Reduction
Major general.....	21	17	4
Brigadier general.....	46	37	9
Colonel.....	470	384	86
Lieutenant colonel.....	577	473	104
Major.....	1,725	1,411	314
Captain.....	3,450	2,822	628
First lieutenant.....	2,667	3,786	855
Second lieutenant.....	1,974		
Total.....	10,930	8,930	2,000

This is a reduction of approximately 18.3 per cent in each grade.

The number of promotion-list officers actually removed from the active list under the bill will be less than 2,000 because average commissioned strength is already limited by restrictions in appropriation acts to an average of 12,000 instead of the authorized maximum of 12,402. The number that will be retired is shown below:

Estimated promotion-list strength, July 1, 1932 (including 1932 class from the Military Academy).....	10,744
New authorized promotion-list strength.....	8,930

Number of promotion-list retirements..... 1,814

The bill stipulates that a sufficient number of non-promotion-list officers be retired to bring the total number of retirements to 2,000. This will require 186 (2,000—1,814) retirements in the non-promotion-list branches.

However, it appears that the provision of the bill limiting total commissioned strength to 10,000 will require still further retirements of non-promotion-list officers. This is shown below:

New authorized commissioned strength.....	10,000
New authorized promotion-list strength.....	8,930
New authorized non-promotion-list strength.....	1,070
Present authorized non-promotion-list strength.....	1,472
Estimated actual non-promotion-list strength (July 1, 1932).....	1,426
Reduction in authorized non-promotion-list strength.....	402
Number of actual non-promotion-list retirements.....	356

A further provision stipulates that on or before May 31, 1933, a sufficient number of colonels and lieutenant colonels shall be retired to provide vacancies within the promotion-list strength of 8,930 for the class of 1933 from the Military Academy. This will require additional retirements as shown below:

Estimated strength of Military Academy class of 1933.....	340
Estimated promotion-list attrition, September, 1932, to May, 1933.....	140

Additional retirements required on or before May 31, 1933..... 200

The bill is defective in that it does not fix the new strength of the non-promotion-list branches—that is, the Medical, Dental, Veterinary, and Medical Administrative Corps, and the chaplains. The present maximum commissioned strengths of these branches are definitely specified in existing law.

The bill makes no provision for the advancement of promotion-list officers from second to first lieutenant. The combined strength of these grades is fixed at 3,786, but this number is not subdivided. It is true that the committee report on the measure contains a table showing 2,179 first lieutenants and 1,607 second lieutenants, but nothing in the language of the bill itself states this apportionment or authorizes promotion into the grade of first lieutenant to maintain that grade at any definite strength.

In framing the national defense act it was the intention of Congress to embody in law the following essential elements of national defense:

a. To provide an Army of the United States consisting of three components—the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserves.

b. To organize this Army into the military units necessary to form the basis for a complete and immediate mobilization of the Nation's man power in a national emergency.

c. To make provision for the mobilization of the Nation's material resources and the maintenance of war reserves as an element in mobilization.

To carry out the responsibilities imposed by the act, the Regular Army is called upon to furnish officers for all manner of important duties beyond the limits of the Regular Establishment itself. The number of officers now assigned to duty with the civilian components, about 1,650, is considerably below the number demanded. The proposed reduction in the commissioned personnel of the Regular Army, combined with the relief of all retired officers now on active duty, as is also contemplated by the bill, will necessarily result in a drastic curtailment of the activities of the Army

in administering the forces of the National Guard (187,000), the Organized Reserves (108,000), and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (127,000). The national defense act originally provided for a corps of approximately 18,000 regular officers. Appropriations in recent years have limited this number to an average of 12,000. The War Department has reported to Congress that the minimum number of officers required in the Regular Army to enable it reasonably to carry out its mission is 14,063. This number is required; to enable reasonable provision to be made for the training of the civilian components, to maintain a small, balanced, mobile force for emergencies, to man in part the seacoast defenses of the continental United States, and to allow reasonably adequate garrisons in the overseas possessions.

Even with the force of 12,000 officers now provided, the calls for assignments to duty with the National Guard, the Organized Reserves, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps can not be met, while the present shortage of officers with troop units of the Regular Army is a matter of grave concern to the War Department. A reduction of 2,000 officers and the relief of the 134 retired officers now on active duty would force the War Department to curtail many essential activities to an extent that would practically nullify the provisions of the national defense act. A cursory survey of the situation indicates that the following reductions in the numbers of promotion-list officers now assigned to highly important duties would be necessary:

	Number	Per cent
Foreign garrisons.....	336	20
Duty with the National Guard.....	229	50
Duty with the Organized Reserves.....	227	50
Duty with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.....	308	50
Instructors at service schools.....	88	30
Students at special service schools, except flying schools.....	414	50
Students at general service schools.....	157	50
Instructors at the United States Military Academy.....	38	20
Officers on recruiting duty.....	42	50
Total.....	1,839	

There are at the present time no more officers assigned to overseas garrisons than are necessary properly to officer the units assigned to those garrisons. A reduction in the number of officers at these strategic outposts would seriously handicap their power of resistance. The importance of maintaining these defenses upon an efficient basis is vital in the present state of world affairs. Their reinforcement in an emergency can not be counted upon. Each of them has its own strategic and tactical mission confined to restricted area. No use could be made of these garrisons in the continental missions assigned to the Army.

The service schools are highly important elements of our military system. The World War demonstrated the necessity of these schools for the training of officers. The small number of regular organizations which provide actual experience with troops makes them of increasing importance. This necessity is augmented by present-day specialization and the rapid development of means and methods of warfare. Just as trained officers are keystones in defense, the schools are keystones in the officers' training.

The proposed reduction in the non-promotion-list branches will necessitate a drastic contraction in the activities of the component corps of the Medical Department and of the Chaplain Corps. Medical Department activities with the National Guard, Organized Reserves, and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps will have to be practically abandoned, and a very considerable reduction will have to be made in the present contribution of the Medical Department toward the care of veterans.

The report of the committee on the bill states that its provisions will not materially lessen the available officer strength in the event of war or national emergency because the officers who are retired will continue to be subject to recall to active service. This statement entirely disregards the fact that the Regular officer in order to be prepared to discharge his duties under the exacting conditions of modern warfare, must be in perpetual state of training and instruction. Officers on the retired list who would be compelled to

engage in commercial activities in order to supplement their retired pay and support their families could not be expected to keep themselves abreast of the military profession.

The report of the committee on the measure contains an estimate of \$3,814,823 as the annual saving that would result from the retirement of 2,000 officers. This is an average of approximately \$1,900 per officer and exceeds the estimates of the War Department. However, accepting the committee's estimate, the saving effected amounts to less than 3 per cent of the amount expended for pay of the Army. Such a saving is entirely insignificant in comparison with the damage which would be done to the national defense and the injurious effect upon morale of the commissioned personnel of the Army if the proposed legislation were adopted.

The bill embodies the astounding proposal that the determination of the officers to be retired in the grades of colonel and below shall be made on age alone, with exceptions in the case of Air Corps officers and second lieutenants. There is also a permissive 5 per cent exemption from this age requirement which the committee report on the bill states is intended to permit the retention of officers who, despite their years, possess special qualifications by reason of which their retirement would be inimical to the best interests of the Army. The bulk of the separations from the active list will, however, occur in a purely arbitrary manner without regard to relative mental or physical fitness or to the individual efficiency as demonstrated by records of service. Surely no organization, civil or military, faced with the necessity for a reduction in personnel, would adopt such a plan for effecting it.

In those portions of the promotion list where officers are arranged in rank in approximate order of age, that is, in the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, and second lieutenant, the retirement provision would serve to remove the officers at the top of each grade. Thus, for example, a high-ranking major, approaching advancement to lieutenant colonel, where he would be among the younger officers in the grade to which promoted, might be ruthlessly removed from the active list without regard for demonstrated efficiency, while less able officers farther down in the grade and a few years younger would not be even considered for retirement. All of the surviving members of entire classes from the Military Academy and of groups of officers from other sources who entered the Army in a body might be forced into retirement if they happen to be at the top of the grade they occupy.

The additional reduction required to be made on or before May 31, 1933, in the grades of colonel and lieutenant colonel in order to provide vacancies for the Military Academy class of 1933 would be practically concentrated in the colonels' grades. This is because the older officers of these two combined grades would naturally be found in the higher one. Many deserving officers would thus be removed from the active list at a time when they are hoping to be selected for promotion to general officer and thus achieve the culmination of a successful military career.

The proposed legislation takes no account whatever of the special technical requirements of different branches of the Army. Retirements may fall more heavily on one arm or service than on another and the officers removed from the active list in this haphazard manner will leave an unbalanced personnel in the various branches of the Military Establishment. Attention is invited to the table which is appended hereto as Exhibit A and which illustrates this effect. For example, 50 of the 84 permanent officers of the Judge Advocate General's department will be retired while the Quartermaster Corps and Finance Department will lose more than one-half of their present personnel.

The committee report on the bill states that it will have a beneficial effect upon promotion, and will serve to correct the unfortunate conditions now existing on the promotion list due to the presence of the World War "hump" of officers. Consideration of its operation shows definitely that this will not be the case. Since the authorized strength of each grade is reduced by the number of officers who are required to be retired, there will be no acceleration whatever of promotion by the retirements made on or before

September 30, 1932. On the contrary, so far as future promotion is concerned, the removal of the older officers from the active list will diminish or entirely discontinue future retirements for age, which are a potent source of the attrition which produces promotion. For this reason, the effect of the bill will be a retardation rather than an acceleration of advancement. It is true that the retirement of approximately 200 colonels and lieutenant colonels in May, 1933, will produce advancement to that extent in the grades below colonel. This effect will, however, not be a continuing one, and once the promotion due to this cause has been made the rate of promotion will again slow down.

The report of the committee on the measure quotes certain passages from the report of the Interdepartmental Pay Personnel Board in justification of the procedure which it proposes. These quotations are lifted from their context in such a way as to be given a wholly improper interpretation. The plan proposed in this bill is not in any respect whatever similar to the promotion plan proposed by the Interdepartmental Pay Personnel Board. That board was formed in compliance with a request made to the President by a joint committee of Congress asking that a system of promotion be devised which would equalize the rate of advancement in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the three lesser services, which are also paid under the joint pay act of 1922.

The board was assigned a specific problem which was, in substance, that of accelerating Army promotion within a reasonable period to equality with that of the Navy. To obtain this result necessarily involved certain compulsory removals from the active list of the Army; but these removals, as the report most clearly shows when considered in its entirety, were to be made solely upon the basis of efficiency and with a view to retaining on the active list those officers whose accomplishments indicated that they were of the greatest value to the service. This principle, which was the guiding one in the work of the Interdepartmental Pay-Personnel Board, has been completely and entirely disregarded in drawing the provisions for retirement which are contained in this bill.

I am appending to these remarks, as Exhibits A and B, two tables which show the details of the retirements that would occur as completely as it has been possible to work them out in the time available. Table A gives the retirement of promotion-list officers by branches and indicates the large proportional losses that would be suffered by certain branches, notably the Judge Advocate General's Department, the Quartermaster Corps, and the Finance Department. Exhibit B makes a further analysis of the retirements and shows how they would be distributed by grade and branch.

I sincerely hope the strength of the officer personnel of the Army will not be reduced, and, if perchance it should be the opinion of a majority of the Members of this House to take such action, I again express a hope. That hope is that elimination will not be made on a basis of age only, without due consideration being given to the efficiency of the particular officers affected.

EXHIBIT A

Promotion list officers—Age in grade separations

	Strength as of Apr. 30, 1932	To be eliminated	Strength after elimination
Major generals.....	21	4	17
Brigadier generals.....	46	9	37
Adjutant General's Department.....	81	17	74
Judge Advocate General's Department.....	84	50	34
Quartermaster Corps.....	644	267	277
Finance Department.....	122	75	47
Corps of Engineers.....	561	76	485
Ordnance Department.....	284	47	237
Signal Corps.....	242	41	201
Chemical Warfare Service.....	90	19	71
Cavalry.....	942	87	855
Field Artillery.....	1,477	145	1,332
Coast Artillery Corps.....	978	93	885
Infantry.....	3,614	542	3,072
Air Corps.....	1,256	208	1,048
Philippine Scouts.....	73	34	39
Total.....	10,525	1,814	8,711

EXHIBIT B

Promotion list officers—Age in grade separations

	Major generals	Brigadier generals	Colonels	Lieutenant colonels	Majors	Captains	First lieutenants	Total
Major generals.....	4							4
Brigadier generals.....		9						9
Adjutant General's Department.....			5	5	4	3	0	17
Judge Advocate General's Department.....			4	2	33	8	3	50
Quartermaster Corps.....			10	11	32	211	103	367
Finance Department.....			2	5	28	21	18	75
Corps of Engineers.....			5	2	18	20	31	76
Ordnance Department.....			4	2	13	20	8	47
Signal Corps.....			0	1	2	23	15	41
Chemical Warfare Service.....			0	1	5	3	10	19
Cavalry.....			15	19	4	28	21	87
Field Artillery.....			3	5	25	40	72	145
Coast Artillery Corps.....			10	11	22	30	20	93
Infantry.....			27	36	109	198	172	542
Air Corps.....			0	4	9	19	176	208
Philippine Scouts.....			0	0	10	4	20	34
Total.....	4	9	85	104	314	628	669	1,814

MASONIC MUTUAL RELIEF ASSOCIATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill S. 2775, to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1869, as amended, and pass the same, and to lay a similar House bill (H. R. 7357) on the table, it having been considered by the committee, and being on the calendar to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2775, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was called on the calendar a few days ago I objected to it because I thought it might set a bad precedent of giving Federal charters to corporations, but I find that this is a proper amendment to their rights, and I withdraw the objection that I made to it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1869, as amended, is amended by striking out the word "Association" in the name of the organization and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Insurance Co.," so that the name of the organization shall read "Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co."

SEC. 2. Sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 of such act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The company shall have the power to make all and every insurance appertaining to or connected with life or disability risks of whatever kind or nature; and to grant, purchase, or dispose of annuities; to make insurance against injury, disablement, or death resulting from accident and against disablement resulting from sickness and every insurance appertaining thereto; to make and accept reinsurance of any risks; and to furnish any aid or service to promote the health and welfare of its policyholders and their beneficiaries: *Provided, however,* That the company shall forever be conducted for the mutual benefit of its policyholders and their beneficiaries and not for profit; and, as to its business transacted in the District of Columbia or in any State or other jurisdiction in which it is licensed, shall be subject to all laws of such District, State, or other jurisdiction governing similar mutual insurance companies.

"SEC. 3. The number of directors of said company shall be fixed by the by-laws and shall be at least 21, a number of whom, less than a majority, shall be elected by the policyholders at the annual meeting of the company from among themselves for a term of three years; that in all cases of a tie vote the choice shall be determined by lot, and in all other cases a plurality vote shall decide. The annual meeting of the company shall be held at such time and place as provided in the by-laws. The board of directors shall elect from among the policyholders at their first meeting succeeding the annual meeting of the company a president, one or more vice presidents, a secretary, and a treasurer, and from time to time such additional officers as the by-laws may provide. The president, the vice presidents, the secretary, and the treasurer shall each give bond with surety to the company in

such sum as the board of directors may require for the faithful performance of his duties. At all meetings of the board of directors 12 of the board shall form a quorum. In case of any vacancy in the board of directors by death, resignation, or otherwise, such vacancy shall be filled by the remaining directors from among the policyholders of the company to serve for the remainder of the unexpired term.

"Sec. 4. The board of directors shall have full power to make and prescribe such by-laws, rules, and regulations as they shall deem needful and proper for the elections herein provided, and for the disposition and management of the business, funds, property, and effects of the company, not contrary to this charter or to the laws of the United States, and they shall have power to alter or amend the same as the interests of the company, in their opinion, may require.

"Sec. 5. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to affect or impair in any manner whatsoever any vested right or interest existing in or under any contract of the company."

Sec. 3. Such act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof a section as follows:

"Sec. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the gentlewoman from New Jersey to explain the purposes of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. This bill, Mr. Speaker, seeks to amend the charter of the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Association in order to broaden its service to its policyholders.

Mr. DYER. In other words, that it may take insurance from other people than Masons?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. DYER. And is that the only purpose?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. It is understood that the business shall be conducted for the benefit of the policyholders and the beneficiaries, and not for profit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7357) was laid on the table.

CLOSING WATER STREET BETWEEN TWENTY-SECOND AND TWENTY-THIRD STREETS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 50, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-second and Twenty-third Streets, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider this joint resolution in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to close upper Water Street, between Twenty-second and Twenty-third Streets NW., lying north of Potomac Park and south of square 62: Provided, That the consent in writing of the owners of three-fourths of all private property on the south side of square 62 is first had and obtained; and upon the closing of said street between the limits named the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to transfer the land contained in the bed of said street to the Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital as part of the park system of the District of Columbia: Provided further, That the said commissioners be, and they are hereby, authorized to enter upon said closed area at all times for the purpose of maintenance and repair of all existing sewers and sewer appurtenances.

Sec. 2. The Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital is authorized to transfer to the American Pharmaceutical Association such an area adjacent to the land owned by the said association as shall be agreed upon between the association and the two commissions hereinafter named, so that the location and the setting of the association's building will conform to the plan prepared by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts for the treatment of that area, and in the construction of said building the said association shall take such steps as are necessary to insure the safety of existing sewers and sewer appurtenances: *Provided, That the American Pharmaceutical Association agrees, contemporaneously with the above transfer to it, to transfer to the United States of America title to a strip of land owned by said association 17 feet in depth along Twenty-third Street, for the purpose of widening said street as an approach to the Lincoln Memorial: Provided further, That the design of the said association's building shall be such as to be approved by the*

National Commission of Fine Arts, and its use shall be limited to organizations and institutions serving American pharmacy on a nonprofit basis.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION, ETC., OF CERTAIN PIPE LINES FOR PETROLEUM

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7305) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from New Jersey calls up the bill H. R. 7305.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7305.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7305, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, with the understanding that it be printed in the Record as if read, I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, authorized and empowered to grant permission to the Gulf Refining Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Texas and registered and doing business in the District of Columbia, to lay down, construct, maintain, and use not more than 10 pipe lines for the carriage of petroleum and petroleum products from a point or points within square 662 in the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, said square being bounded on the north by R Street, on the south by S Street, on the east by Water Street and South Capitol Street, and on the west by Half Street (west), in and through Water Street, South Capitol Street, in an easterly direction to lot 4 of square south of square 708, which lot is bounded on the north by lands of the Standard Oil Co., on the south by S Street, extended, on the east by Anacostia River, and on the west by South Capitol Street.

Sec. 2. All the construction and use provided for herein shall be in accordance with plans approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and under such regulations and rentals as the said commissioners may make and establish in connection herewith.

Sec. 3. No permission granted or enjoyed hereunder shall vest any title or interest in or to the land within the above-mentioned streets, or affect any right, title, or interest of the United States in or to land within square south of square 708.

Sec. 4. The Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to permit the Gulf Refining Co. to construct and maintain not more than 10 pipe lines for carrying petroleum and petroleum products through Water Street and South Capitol Street, and to permit them to convey those products from vessels to docks on the Anacostia River to a plant which they propose to construct.

There is no opposition at all to the bill, and I understand it will give employment to at least from five hundred to two or three thousand men.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to put in certain documents and also excerpts to which I shall refer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I have objected to this bill on several occasions in this Congress and have blocked its passage in the previous Congress.

The Gulf Refining Co. is one of the big international oil combines owned by our former Secretary of the Treasury,

Mr. Mellon, and his interests, which, with the big Dutch Shell Co., has been manufacturing gasoline and crude petroleum in Mexico, South America, and other peon countries and bringing its products in tankers to this country free of any duty, competing with the American independents.

During the last three years they have run out of business the independent oil operators in the United States. They have brought about such a condition that in the districts of my colleagues, Mr. PATMAN and Mr. SANDERS, in east Texas, oil last year sold as low as 2 cents a barrel. Just think of it. Two cents a barrel, when it is estimated by our Government experts that it costs \$1.01 a barrel to produce it, considering the overhead and expense of exploitation, and so forth. Bringing in such foreign oil has in the last three years made paupers of millionaire independent operators. In Oklahoma and Texas alone it has put out of employment a hundred thousand heads of families who have been unable to get jobs since then. This Gulf Co., to which this bill grants a free pipe-line franchise through Washington, and which, with the big Dutch Shell Co., has been before Congress for several years with the biggest lobby that money could produce in Washington to defeat any protection that could be put against foreign oil, now comes here and asks this new concession—a pipe line through the Nation's Capital.

It has been estimated that these two big monopolies are able, with their peon labor in Venezuela and South America, to produce gasoline in their Venezuelan refineries and ship it in their tankers and lay it down in New York City and retail it at 4 cents a gallon with a big profit to themselves, yet all this time we are paying 15 and 16 and 17 cents a gallon all through this section, in the Nation's Capital and elsewhere. Now it is sought to give this big monopoly an extra monopolistic right under the very streets of the Nation's Capital, with these pipe lines.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I will yield when I get through, but first I want to put some facts before you.

The gentleman from Georgia, General PARKER, complained a moment ago and said he was protesting against Members who had important matters to bring before the country not having a right to get up and present their ideas and their facts. General PARKER knows all about military affairs. But I am afraid General PARKER displayed a little ignorance on House procedure. You can always get time in this House and on this floor if you know how. It is all in knowing how.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I do not want to be discourteous, but I do want to put some facts before the House that must be placed before the country at this time. A Member can always get time to do that if he pursues his rights under the rules. He does not have to ask for two minutes. District day is always a day on which you can get time, if you know how, to say anything you want to about the good of the country and the good of the Nation. That is the reason I am getting time on this day, because I have something to say about the good of the order and the good of the country in connection with my protest against the granting of this extra monopoly under the streets of Washington to the Gulf Refining Co. and Mr. Mellon.

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question there?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I regret that I can not just now. I decline to yield until I get through with my remarks. Then I will yield to any and all Members who wish to ask me questions, because I do not want to take any more time than is necessary to make my remarks. That is the reason I asked permission to put some excerpts and documents in the RECORD without reading them.

It was claimed the other day by the distinguished minority leader and some of the other leaders on his side that the votes which went through the tellers in the House on the economy bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union were different from the votes on final roll call. That may be; but did you know that the votes between tellers are secret, confidential, between the Mem-

bers? Did you know that, with all the power that the press boys exercise in the gallery, to sting us whenever they get ready—sometimes we deserve it and sometimes we do not, but they sting us whenever they want to, personally, individually, and collectively—did you know that, with all that power which they exercise, not one of them will ever give out the name of anybody who passes through tellers, because it is an unwritten rule here, and it has been for years in this House of Representatives and elsewhere that, until Members go down in black and white on a yea-and-nay vote, they can not be recorded individually? That is the reason I say that the important votes of Members of Congress are the yea-and-nay votes. And that is the reason that I have insisted on many yea-and-nay votes. That is the reason given by our "wet" brethren for putting you "on the spot" with the Beck-Linthicum resolution so that there could be a yea-and-nay vote, and the people of the United States could find out how Members here stood on the wet-and-dry question. They recognized that "votes by tellers" could not be made public, and it required a record vote to hold Members responsible for their position on the question.

When you go on record on a yea or nay vote, Mr. Chairman, that is when you are willing to make your stand on public matters a public record before the people.

I want to call your attention to some of those yea-and-nay record votes on the economy bill. Your minority leader, on May 5, 1932, got up on this floor and said, as recorded on page 9675 of the RECORD:

The majority of the Members on this side of the aisle—

Meaning his Republican side, and meaning his Republican Members, if you please—

have stood for the economy bill, and if it had received the same support on the other side of the aisle there would have been no need of this message.

Was BERT SNELL frank that day when he said this? No.

Was the speech that he made from this floor last Saturday a typical BERT SNELL speech? No. BERT SNELL is a square shooter; he is a hard hitter when he has the facts with him. When BERT SNELL has the facts with him he stands up here, straight up, head up, eyes front, and tells you about it. When he comes in here and hangs over this stand as he did the other day throughout that speech, you can bet your head it is political; he is not speaking the real, but political, facts. It is not a Bert Snell straight-from-the-shoulder speech.

Let me call your attention to some of those record votes. Here is the vote on the consolidation of the Army and Navy. Everybody knows that that will save money.

Mr. BACON. I do not.

Mr. BLANTON. That is because the gentleman has not studied the question as others of us have.

His President, President Harding, studied that question; and a President never suggests anything to Congress unless his Cabinet approves of it. Did you know that? That is what the Cabinet is for, to sit around the table and approve the President's program. Whenever a President comes in and makes a recommendation you can bet your head that his Cabinet has approved of it. Who was his Cabinet? Mr. Secretary Hoover was one member of it. He came in here and recommended to the Congress that it pass a bill consolidating the Navy Department and the Army into one Department of National Defense with one head to it, unifying all the various services and saving the surplus and the overlapping and the duplications. Why, we have four air services. For every enterprise of the Navy you will find a corresponding enterprise of the Army.

If you unify the two services and put them under one head, you can cut off about one-half of the expense of both of them. President Harding recommended that. Thinking men of America have been for it for a long time. It would save at least \$100,000,000 annually.

Do you know why Congress has not been able to put this consolidation into effect? The Secretary of War will not let Congress. The Secretary of the Navy will not let Congress.

The big chiefs of staff will not let Congress. The big generals and the big admirals will not let Congress do it. They exercise such tremendous power over the President and over the Cabinet and over Congress, if you please, that they will not let this salutary consolidation to effect economy be brought about in the interests of the people.

In the President's message the other day, if you look at and analyze it, he proposed the consolidation of the munitions bureaus in both the Army and the Navy; he proposed to consolidate hospitals and other things in the Army and Navy. That is all the consolidation bill means, a unification of services. He recommends that after the economy bill has been riddled by Republicans.

Now, as soon as this consolidation was proposed in the bill by our friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS], than whom there is no one better informed in the House, strong opposition was brought against it by Cabinet officers, generals, and admirals. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS] has been here many years; he is a man of high standing and integrity, a man of good judgment, who knows all about appropriations. He knows all about the Army and the Navy. He has been appropriating for both departments for years. He has sat across the table from admirals, generals, and heads of departments, and knows exactly what their needs and necessities are, knows what the needs and necessities of adequate national defense are. He is a patriotic American. Why was not his judgment good?

As soon as he brought the bill to consolidate the Army and Navy Departments into one Department of National Defense before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments you found the Secretary of War coming before it lobbying, you found the Secretary of the Navy lobbying against it, both trying to kill it. You found the great Navy League of the United States, which, whenever it wants to, spans your President, and you let them get away with it.

There is nobody here who will say they did not spank your President not long ago and nobody has gotten up here and attacked them for doing it. Who has gotten up here on this floor among your big Republican leaders and defended your President against the great Navy League of America? Not one of you. Why, Carl, if you had done that, those wets in Chicago could not have beaten you to save their lives. People like men who defend their President when a big navy league jumps on him.

The Army and Navy Club here in Washington, than which there is no greater lobby in the world or one with greater influence throughout the United States, began fighting consolidation, and consolidation was finally defeated in that committee.

Then the specially selected Economy Committee took up the question of consolidation, and what happened? You found the great Navy League and the Army Club sending their admirals and their major generals in battle formation against consolidation. The Navy League and the Army and Navy Club had to have some high officer handle that proposal here on the floor of the House. Whom did they pick? They used Army methods and Navy methods to do their picking. They had to recognize seniority; they had to pick between our friend General CHIPERFIELD and General MARTIN.

General MARTIN happened to be a regular. General MARTIN happened to be senior to General CHIPERFIELD; he happened to outrank him; his seat at the social table was a little farther up than that of General CHIPERFIELD, so they picked General MARTIN, our retired general from the United States Army, to lead the Republicans down the line against consolidation. So General MARTIN moved to strike consolidation out of the bill. And he was assisted by General CHIPERFIELD, and General PARKER, and General Goss, and Colonel SNELL, and Colonel TILSON, and Republican cohorts galore, and when consolidation came up on roll-call vote, as shown on pages 9515-9516, we find that 150 Republicans voted under the leadership of that retired general against

consolidation, against this economy saving of at least \$100,000,000 a year to the people of this country, and they killed it here in the House.

And who led the debate against consolidation? It was none other than your Republican minority leader, Mr. SNELL, of New York, ably assisted by your Republican former minority leader, Mr. TILSON, who is one of your real leaders yet; and of the 150 Republicans voting against consolidation you find Republican leaders like my friend, Doctor CROWTHER, of New York, who is one of your great tariff leaders; our friend from Massachusetts, Mr. TREADWAY; Mr. BACHARACH, one of the big members of your organization; our distinguished jurist friend from Maine, CARROLL BEEDY; BOB SIMMONS, of Nebraska; Mr. MAPES, of Michigan; our friend, CARL CHINDBLOM, of Illinois; Mr. MICHENER, who was your spokesman the other day; Mr. HAWLEY, the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; Mr. HAUGEN, the former great chairman of the Agricultural Committee; Mr. REED, of New York; Doctor TEMPLE; our friend CABLE, of Ohio; RAMSEYER; LEHLBACH; LUCE; PARKER, of New York; SHREVE; Doctor SUMMERS, of Washington; and even TINKHAM, our friend TINKHAM, who, by accident, the other day introduced a bill against birth control, and when he found out what he had introduced, how he did get up here and try to withdraw it. He said it got in here by an error on the part of his secretary.

It is quite funny about TINKHAM. I have served with him for about 15 years, and I have never heard him make any speeches except on two subjects the whole time he has been here, his two subjects being, first, condemning Methodists, and, second, condemning southerners for not taking negroes in their primaries and for hanging rapists.

You know, most of his constituents are either Catholics or colored people, and he is forced to do something to be re-elected by them. He imagines that his Catholics do not like Bishop Cannon and do not like Dr. Clarence True Wilson, who happen to be Methodists, so every year he makes periodical speeches against Bishop Cannon and Doctor Wilson, catering to that sentiment in his district in Massachusetts. You do not blame him. He has to do that to stay in office. You know also the Catholics do not believe in birth control; neither do the colored people. He thought he would help his political standing in his Massachusetts district by introducing that bill against birth control. He introduced it one day and it was properly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

When his constituents saw how far-reaching it was, they did not like it. Then he immediately ran in here and tried to withdraw it, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA-GUARDIA] would not let him. I am going to put his exact language and one or two paragraphs from that measure in my remarks. Why, even TINKHAM, the great anti-birth-control Congressman of Massachusetts, was with you against consolidation. So was WASON; my friend UNDERHILL and Governor YATES. General CHIPERFIELD followed his regular leader, our retired major general, and our friend Goss, of Connecticut, did likewise. Down the line some in seniority was your General DE PRIEST, of Illinois. He was following the bunch. Do you know why we will not allow colored people to come into the primaries in Texas? We like them in their places, and they like us. We are the best friends on earth to the colored people. Every colored person in my district would vote for me in the primary if he could do so. But we do not let them vote in our primaries, because they all vote with you Republicans in November. We do not allow them to hamstring us in our primaries in July and then vote with you Republicans in November. Then I find one of your Republican subleaders, Mr. SCHAFER, of Wisconsin, following the bunch against consolidation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What was this on?

Mr. BLANTON. This was the vote on that Army and Navy consolidation. For fear I might leave out some of the other leaders I am going to put the balance of them in my remarks to show you how many voted against that Army and Navy consolidation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does not the gentleman think the Army and Navy could save a lot of money even without consolidation? For instance, take these recruiting offices. Why could they not be consolidated?

Mr. BLANTON. They could save on any proper consolidation. Let me tell you what we have in my home city of bilene. As soon as you get off the train there, you see a great big sign, "Navy recruiting office." Then another sign, "Army recruiting office." Then another sign, "United States Marine Corps recruiting office." Three of them in one city, my home town, with three different agents there spending your money like water. Why do they not have just one? They would have just one with consolidation.

So that hereafter it can not be denied that Republicans did defeat the economy proposal to consolidate the Army and Navy into one unified department of national defense, I want to name in this RECORD the Republicans who voted against consolidation, as shown in roll call No. 66, on pages 9515-9516 of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 3, 1932. Title VI of the Economy Committee's bill, which Title VI was known as "the national defense reorganization act," would have consolidated the War Department and the Navy Department into one department of national defense. The vote came on the amendment by General MARTIN, of Oregon, our retired major general, to "strike out all of Title VI, the national defense reorganization act," and the following Republicans voted with General MARTIN to strike it out, there being 150 such Republicans to wit: Adkins, Aldrich, Allen, Andrews of New York, Arentz, Bacharach, Bacon, Baldrige, Barbour, Beck, Beedy, Bohn, Bolton, Britten, Brumm, Burdick, Butler, Campbell of Pennsylvania, Carter of California, Carter of Wyoming, Cavicchia, Chindblom, Chipfield, Clague, Clancy, Clarke of New York, Cochran of Pennsylvania, Cole of Iowa, Colton, Connolly, Cooke, Coyle, Crail, Crowther, Caulkin, Curry, Dallinger, Darrow, Davenport, De Priest, Doutrich, Eaton of Colorado, Eaton of New Jersey, Englebright, Erk, Estep, Evans of California, Finley, Fish, Foss, Free, French, Garber, Gibson, Gifford, Golder, Goodwin, Goss, Hadley, Hall of Illinois, Hancock of New York, Hardy, Hartley, Haugen, Hawley, Hess, Holmes, Hooper, Hopkins, Horr, Houston of Delaware, William E. Hull, Jenkins, Johnson of South Dakota, Johnson of Washington, Kahn, Kelly of Pennsylvania, Kinzer, Kopp, Kurtz, Lankford of Virginia, Leavitt, Lehlbach, Loofbourow, Lovette, Luce, McFadden, McLaughlin, McLeod, Maas, Magrady, Manlove, Mapes, Martin of Massachusetts, Michener, Millard, Moore of Ohio, Mouser, Nelson, Niedringhaus, Nolan, Parker of New York, Partridge, Pittenger, H. J. Pratt, Ruth Pratt, Ramseyer, Ransley, Reed of New York, Rich, Rogers of Massachusetts, Sanders of New York, Schafer, Seger, Seiberling, Shott, Shreve, Simmons, Smith of Idaho, Snell, Snow, Stokes, Strong of Pennsylvania, Summers of Washington, Swanson, Swick, Swing, Taber, Temple, Tilson, Timberlake, Tinkham, Treadway, Turpin, Underhill, Wason, Welch of California, Welsh of Pennsylvania, White, Whitley, Wigglesworth, Wolcott, Wolfenden, Wolverton, Woodruff, Wyant, and Yates, aggregating 150 Republicans who voted against consolidation. If any 12 of said 150 Republicans had changed their votes consolidation would have passed.

Let me call your attention to what your Republican sub-leader, Mr. SCHAFER, who is a member of the Committee on Expenditures, said last Saturday, on page 9769 of the RECORD. He said:

Within the last three months five members of the President's Cabinet appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Five members of the Cabinet. Note that. Then he said:

Before the Economy Committee was created and the members of the Expenditures Committee asked where savings could be made, not one of them could indicate a saving of one-half of 1 per cent of what the administration now claims can be saved, according to press releases.

Is not that a terrible indictment coming from your quasi, semi, sub-Republican leader, SCHAFER, of Wisconsin? Five

of them, and they could not tell them one single thing to effect any saving at all by any change of law. Is not that ridiculous? I am going to read you an excerpt from a real Republican and from a real leader and from a real representative of the people, a man who has served as an executive official of this Nation with honor and distinction, a man who knows whereof he speaks, a man who has high intelligence, a man who has good judgment, Mr. Beck, of Pennsylvania, a former Solicitor General of the United States. I want you to remember what he said last Saturday.

Listen! Did you know that the President of the United States has power now to kill any bureau in Washington he wants to and send the employees home? Did you know he has the inherent power right now as Chief Executive of the United States Government to kill any commission he wants to kill and to restrict and limit any department of government with respect to expenditures. Did you know that he can fire any employee of the Government he wants to? Does anybody question this? If so, I yield now to anyone to get up here and say that he questions this statement. Is there a Member here who denies that the President has such power? If so, I want to see who he is. I want to see how ignorant some one may be. [Laughter.]

I will show you that your former great Solicitor General says that the President has such power. Here is what Mr. Beck said on page 9777 of the RECORD of last Saturday.

There is a second suggestion that I want to make, in which respect I think the Executive has a greater responsibility than we have, and I want to commend this to the attention of the Executive.

He is talking to the President now. The President was talking to us the other day and now Beck is talking to the President. It takes a Solicitor General to talk back to a President, especially a Republican Solicitor General to a Republican President, and he is now talking back to him and makes this further statement. It ought to begin, "Mr. President." He ought to have said, "Mr. President," when he spoke as follows:

It can not be questioned, since the removal-from-office case of Meyers v. the United States (272 U. S.) which I happened to argue, that the President has the constitutional power to remove, a power which can not be controlled or restricted by Congress in any way.

He says the President has the inherent power to remove which Congress can not stop or restrict, and then he says:

This high prerogative means that if the President deems it in the public interest that any member of the executive departments should be removed, such is his power. The Supreme Court has so stated. This gave him a power, directly or indirectly, to remove any official in the executive department for whom the public service has no real need.

Then why does he not remove idle employees and abolish useless bureaus?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Andrew Jackson would have had a big time if he had known that.

Mr. BLANTON. I wish to God we had an Andrew Jackson in the White House now. If we had an Andrew Jackson there, he would abolish half of our bureaus and he would make your prohibition violators in Baltimore and Philadelphia and New York hide in the woods. He would send a bunch of marines there and close up every speak-easy you have in your town and the gentleman knows it. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MILLARD. Was Andrew Jackson a prohibitionist?

Mr. BLANTON. No; but he was a real President, and he knew that the duty was upon his shoulders to see that the laws of the country were obeyed and enforced.

Mr. MILLARD. But he was not a prohibitionist?

Mr. BLANTON. I have heard lots of slurs cast on Congressmen who vote dry, and who, they say, sometimes take a wet drink. I shall repeat what I have said before. I have been here 15 years. I have been pretty active. I have been pretty closely associated with the Members of Congress. I believe I know by name and face and by State the Members so that I can say, "The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. TIMBERLAKE," and so forth, as well as any other Member on this floor. I have been here 15 years and I have never yet

seen a Member of Congress take a drink of liquor—not one. I know some of them have done so, because I have been able to smell it once in a while, but I have never seen one take a drink.

I think as a whole my 434 colleagues, taken as a class, are as fine a bunch of loyal, patriotic Americans, who have the best interests of the people at heart, as exists on the face of the earth to-day. Some of them are like LINTHICUM and they want to make a big reputation as a big wet leader and some of them are like BECK and others on that subject, but they are all right even if they do get lots of Members in trouble. They got our friend CARL CHINDBLOM in trouble.

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; we did not do that.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; you did. It is a public calamity for him to leave this House with his valuable experience here as a Member of the Congress. [Applause.] It is a public calamity, and who did it? You wets did it.

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; we did not do it at all; and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] knows we would not do it. We would not have him go if we could help it. Ask him yourself.

Mr. BLANTON. You caused him to come out for this Beck-Linthicum resolution and caused the drys in Chicago to rise up and defeat him. That is what you did. You caused another good Member to be defeated the other day down in Indiana, as well as causing some others to be defeated. You now have that O'Connor beer resolution (H. R. 10017) up here at the desk, and it has been there waiting for signatures since April 12, 1932, and you have not got it signed up yet, as only 133 Members have dared to sign it, and you will never get it signed up. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM] performed a great service for the country. He is a martyr to the cause. They are noticing what happened to him and they are a little more careful about the kind of Beck-Linthicum documents they sign in the future. [Laughter.] Every pressure known to modern lobbying has been brought to bear on Members, urging them to sign up. The liquor interests besiege Members daily. Even threats have been made. But Members now are more careful about signing such petitions.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield inasmuch as he has referred to me?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I will yield to my friend.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. While I have been a Member of Congress I have voted for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment—

Mr. BLANTON. Like a good scout, the gentleman has been brave, and he ought to have continued on the same way. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHINDBLOM. The eighteenth amendment was a part of the Constitution when I came here. I have voted for enforcement, I have voted for laws which seemed sometimes to me quite drastic, for the enforcement of that amendment.

I did not believe when the amendment was put into the Constitution that it was the best method of handling the temperance question, and when the question arose whether I would support a proposition for repeal or resubmission I carried out the same views that I had had all my life and supported the Beck-Linthicum proposal. [Applause.]

Mr. DELANEY arose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I never put flowers on a grave. I put them where the living are.

Mr. DELANEY. Will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I want all new Members to know our friend from New York [Mr. DELANEY]; he is one of the finest colleagues we have; he is a good scout. He and I differ on the prohibition question, and differ on this, that, and the other; but he is a good scout. Now I yield to him.

Mr. DELANEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 9777 of the RECORD while he is speaking about the power of the President. Mr. Beck referred to President Cleveland in regard to the work he did, and I think it might be very appropriate here.

Mr. BLANTON. I thank the gentleman, and I will put it in my remarks in the RECORD. Here is what Mr. Beck said:

Let me illustrate by stating that in the administration of that great and wise President, Grover Cleveland, he knew that the departments had thousands of useless employees who were feeding at the public crib and doing little or nothing in return for their salaries, and he instructed his Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of the Treasury Department. Secretary Carlisle did so, and as a result of a careful canvass he developed that there were some hundreds—I have forgotten how many—who had sinecures. Thereupon, one Monday morning, Secretary Carlisle removed these useless employees. Then Congress was empty for the next two or three days. There were no Members here. They were all hurrying to the Treasury Department, and the pressure of Congress was so great upon the administration that the order was revoked. Thus the wise policy of economy of Grover Cleveland was defeated by Congress. How often that has happened since.

What really happened was this: As soon as Carlisle had abolished the bureau, the Washington papers, that some of you seem to be afraid of, made a fuss about it, and the employees began to come up on the Hill, and then Congressmen made demands, and then Carlisle had to put them all back.

Now, Mr. Beck said on Saturday that we had 800,000 employees on the Government pay roll. Here is what he said:

If the President would tell each member of his Cabinet to appoint three discreet men to go through each department and ascertain the employees that did not have an honest day's work, it would develop at once why this Government is the most overmanned government in the world, with its 800,000 civilian employees.

The President, then, by the power of removal could eliminate the dead wood from the department.

The President could remove them if he were not afraid of them. I will vote to send them back home. But how many of you here would vote with me to abolish these useless bureaus?

This Government should take at least 100,000 off the pay roll. Many do not do any work at all. Mr. Beck never said a truer thing in his life when he said there were many Government clerks doing nothing.

If you will appoint a select committee and go with me when they do not anticipate it, I will show you groups standing around doing nothing, and who have not done a good day's work in a month.

Now, many of the Government clerks are fine people. I know a lot of them and they are my friends. They are not to blame; it is their organizations that have forced this on the Government.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Always to a lady.

Mrs. NORTON. Does the gentleman think he is doing an honest day's work to-day?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. That is a fair question. Did you know that there is but one way to reach the American people, and that is by what is said here on the floor of the House, which goes into the RECORD?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment. Let me answer the other question first. There is just one way to reach the American people. It is from this floor and through the RECORD. Mr. BYRNS, our great leader, the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, spoke for an hour here the other day and made a splendid statement that the country was interested in.

The Washington Star did not mention it; the Washington Times did not mention it; the Washington Post did not mention a thing he said except to barely refer to his speech, saying that he made one attacking the President; the News did not carry his speech. Not a Republican paper in the United States carried his speech. Talk about an honest day's work! I worked all day yesterday, even though it was Sunday, and until midnight last night. I am sending this message out to the people of the United States through the RECORD.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. Forty-four thousand copies of this RECORD go out every morning to every part

of the United States. I now appeal to the American people to read that record, to take a statement of these facts on the economy bill and look at it and see what it means; and compare it with what their papers in their community had to say about what Mr. BYRNS said and about what Mr. BANKHEAD said, and about what Mr. LOZIER said, and what other leaders on our side said; not a word of which has ever come to them through the Republican press. And I ask them to examine whether or not the papers in their sections are giving them a square deal on the real news from Washington.

If their papers did not carry that speech of Mr. BYRNS, I hope the Democrats in that section of the country will quit buying those Republican papers, and then I shall have done a good day's work. Has the lady another question?

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; certainly.

Mrs. NORTON. Does the gentleman know that this is District day, and that the time of the District Committee on this day is not supposed to be taken up with discussions of every subject outside of the District business?

Mr. BLANTON. I shall answer that. Just the contrary of what the lady says is permitted by the House rules.

Mrs. NORTON. Does the gentleman think it is fair to the Committee on the District of Columbia to waste a whole day like this?

Mr. BLANTON. Just a moment. I think it is both fair and proper. I did not make the rules. Wiser men than I have ever been made the rules of this House. If they had not wanted such speeches on District day, they would have said, as they said in respect to the work on Calendar Wednesday, that nothing but speeches to the bill should be made; but the statesmen of this country who framed the rules of the House of Representatives knew that the day would come when the newspapers would not tell the truth about what happened here, and they knew there must be opportunity in addition to the general debate on supply bills when Members could send messages to the people of the country through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and if a Member has anything to say and he gets the floor on a day like this he has a right under the rules of the House to speak his sentiments. I have only claimed my rights under the rules of the House of Representatives. Let me call attention to something else.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Not yet. I am going to refer to all these roll calls on that economy measure and analyze them. I am glad that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is here to-day, because I like to have a man present when I am going to refer to him. He said the other day that, with one exception, he went down the line with Mr. McDUFFIE and his Economy Committee. There was just one exception, he said. He said, excluding the vote on the retired Army generals' amendment to knock out the consolidation of the Army and the Navy, he had voted with Mr. McDUFFIE. That was the only exception, he claimed, and he asserted that otherwise he went down the line with Mr. McDUFFIE and his Economy Committee. There is not a man in the House I like better than I do Mr. MICHENER, for he is a fine fellow. I am not reflecting upon him when I comment upon what he said.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like him a whole lot better if he would come over to the wet cause.

Mr. BLANTON. You are not going to get him to do that; he has too much sense to do it. Let me show you about his going down the line with Mr. McDUFFIE. To begin with, on roll call 66, on page 9515 of the RECORD, we find Mr. MICHENER voting "yea" and Mr. McDUFFIE voting "nay." He did not stay with him that time.

Mr. MICHENER. What is that vote on?

Mr. BLANTON. Consolidation. I will let the gentleman look it up and explain it.

Mr. MICHENER. Oh, to be fair, the gentleman should state what it is on.

Mr. BLANTON. That is consolidation, the one exception he claimed. Now, let us get to another one, on the next roll call, No. 67.

Mr. MICHENER. What was it on?

Mr. BLANTON. That was on the motion to recommit.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. That was on the motion of Mr. McDUFFIE to provide, instead of \$2,500 exemption, an exemption of \$2,000. That is all there was in it.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I voted for the furlough plan, for the \$1,000. I did not vote for the high exemption as the gentleman did.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not want the gentleman from Michigan to make a speech in my time. I can not yield.

I ask the Chairman of the committee to have the gentleman from Michigan obey the rules. He is on the Committee on the Judiciary, and God knows that if anyone ought to obey the rules it is a Judiciary Committee member. I will let him explain this. The Economy Committee had placed in its bill an exemption of only \$1,000, and then had caused a reduction of 11 per cent on all salaries over that, including Congressmen and Senators. Mr. BRITTON, of Illinois, had passed an amendment to the bill raising the exemption to \$2,500, which didn't suit the Economy Committee. Chairman McDUFFIE therefore moved to recommit the bill, lowering the exemption from the \$2,500 to only \$2,000, and here is the motion quoted from the RECORD:

Mr. McDUFFIE offers the following motion to recommit: I move to recommit the bill H. R. 11267 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out of section 102 (a) of the Economy Committee amendment the following: "Compensation at an annual rate of \$1,000 or less shall be exempt from reduction, and compensation at an annual rate in excess of \$1,000 shall be reduced by 11 per cent of the amount thereof in excess of \$1,000," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Compensation at an annual rate of \$2,000 or more shall be reduced by 10 per cent, but this subsection shall not reduce below \$2,000 any rate of compensation of \$2,000 or more."

Was not the \$2,000 exemption fairer to the people of the country and the taxpayers and the employees than the \$2,500 exemption? Yet the gentleman from Michigan voted against this motion to recommit on roll call No. 67.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not yield now. My time is short.

Now, the gentleman from Michigan voted against Mr. McDUFFIE there, and by his vote caused the exemption to be \$2,500.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman knows that is not fair.

Mr. BLANTON. That is the reason you will find the newspapers all over the country, in all the States over this Nation, saying that Congress refused to decrease their own salaries, because the gentleman left the exemption of all employees, including Congressmen, at \$2,500 instead of \$2,000, although he did vote for the so-called furlough plan later on.

My resolution, House Joint Resolution 344, is now pending before the committee, wherein I seek to limit congressional salaries to \$7,500. And I have been promised a hearing on it again to-morrow. I voted with my friend McDUFFIE all the way down the line, except that finally I voted for the bill and he voted against it. [Laughter.] There was \$48,000,000 left in the bill and I voted for that, because it was the best we could get, but Mr. McDUFFIE felt bad and did vote against his own bill.

Let me give you another roll call. On roll call 68, page 9518, we find Mr. MICHENER voting "yea" and Mr. McDUFFIE "nay."

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman not state what that is? What is the use of being unfair?

Mr. BLANTON. That was the vote on the furlough plan.

Now, we find on roll call 69 that MICHENER voted "yea" and McDUFFIE "nay." That was on the final passage of the bill. I am glad to say I voted with my friend MICHENER on the final passage, because we did save about \$48,000,000. We ought to have saved \$200,000,000 and would have saved

it if Republicans had not murdered McDUFFIE's economy bill.

Now, I am going to call attention to something that I want to put in the RECORD here in connection with my remarks. I am going to put in a statement by Mr. Malcomb A. McAdoo, of Baltimore, same being an analysis of the expenses of Government for the period 1900 to 1916, inclusive, under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson; of the period 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge; and of the period 1929 to 1931, inclusive, under Hoover.

It will be noted that the average annual increase in such expenditures under Hoover, over the period 1900 to 1916 under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson, amounted to the enormous sum of \$3,389,099,000; that the average annual expense under Hoover, 1929 to 1931, inclusive, exceeded by the sum of \$457,921,000 annually the average annual expenditures under Coolidge, his predecessor, for the years 1925 to 1928, inclusive. It will also be noted by this statement that the average annual expenditures of appropriations for rivers and harbors and for the Army and the Navy for the years 1929 to 1931 under Hoover amounted to \$813,881,226, which is more, by the sum of \$182,125,226 annually than the total annual cost of the Government during the period 1900 to 1916, inclusive, under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson. This is remarkable when it is remembered that all nations are so impoverished now that war is impossible.

Here is the statement above referred to:

STATEMENT BY MR. MALCOMB R. M'ADOO, OF BALTIMORE

Statement of average ordinary annual expenditures of the Federal Government:

First. For the period 1900 to 1916, inclusive, the period between the Spanish-American War and the World War under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson (first term).

Second. For the period 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge immediately preceding Hoover's administration.

Third. For the period 1929 to 1931, under Hoover, with an overwhelming Republican majority in the Senate and the House.

For the period 1900 to 1916, inclusive, average annual ordinary expenditures under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson's first term..... \$631,756,000.00

For the period 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge..... 3,562,934,000.00

For the period 1929 to 1931, inclusive, under Hoover..... 4,020,855,000.00

Average annual increase under Hoover over period 1900 to 1916, under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson's first term..... 3,389,099,000.00

Average annual increase under Hoover over period 1929 to 1931, inclusive, under Coolidge..... 457,921,000.00

State of same on a per capita basis:

For period 1900 to 1916, inclusive, under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson's first term average annual ordinary expenditures per capita, including interest on bonds outstanding..... 7.08

For period 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge..... 30.25

For period 1929 to 1931, inclusive, under Hoover..... 32.95

Same per capita statement, exclusive of interest on bonds outstanding:

For period 1900 to 1916, inclusive, under Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson's first term..... 6.79

For period 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge..... 23.29

For period 1929 to 1931, inclusive, under Hoover..... 27.89

ARMY AND NAVY

In view of the howl about an inadequate Army and Navy, a statement of the average annual expenses of each for these periods is both interesting and illuminating. It is as follows:

Army

Army, 1900 to 1916, inclusive, under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson's first term, average annual expenses, including appropriations for rivers and harbors, but exclusive of expenditures for the Panama Canal and civil expenditures at Washington..... \$142,582,000

Army, 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge, exclusive of annual expenditures for rivers and harbors, but exclusive of civil expenditures at Washington..... 367,099,424

Army, 1929 to 1931, under Hoover..... 449,615,164

Navy

Navy, 1900 to 1916, inclusive, under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson's first term, average annual expenditures..... 100,417,000

Navy, 1925 to 1928, inclusive, under Coolidge..... 327,282,499

Navy, 1929 to 1931, under Hoover..... 364,266,062

It will be noted by these figures that the average annual expenses for the Army and Navy, 1929 to 1931, under Hoover, exclusive of appropriation for rivers and harbors, amounted to \$813,881,226. This exceeded the total average annual expense, 1900 to 1916 (\$631,756,000), for all Government departments under Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson's first term by \$182,125,226.

The claim is made that we have an inadequate Army and Navy. If so, what has become of the annual appropriations for each?

The total expenses of every branch of the Government seem to indicate the dire necessity of a revival of Andrew Jackson's slogan, "Turn the rascals out," with an addition to it of "Turn the lights on."

The figures contained herein are compiled from verbatim copies of the records contained on pages 336 and 337 of the World Almanac for 1932.

Mr. BLANTON. Under unanimous consent I will also insert a statement prepared by Mr. Manton M. Wyvell, of the Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C., which shows how certain stocks declined when Congress was not in session. The decline in value is one of the most serious in all history. Here is his statement:

Statement by Mr. Manton M. Wyvell

1931

Name of stock	Mar. 4 low	Nov. 28 close	Points lost	Approximate percentage of loss
Illinois Central.....	78	13	65	83
New York Central.....	116 1/4	28 1/4	88 1/4	75
Baltimore & Ohio.....	76 1/4	23 1/4	53	68
American Telephone & Telegraph.....	193 3/8	125 1/8	68 1/4	36
International Telephone & Telegraph.....	31 1/2	10 1/4	20 1/4	66
United Corporation.....	25	11 1/8	13 1/8	55
Electric Bond & Share.....	53 1/4	15 1/8	38 1/8	71
Niagara-Hudson.....	13 1/4	7 1/2	5 1/2	43
Tri-State Utilities.....	2 1/4	6 1/4	2 1/4	99
United States Steel.....	143 1/4	53 1/4	90 1/4	62
Bethlehem Steel.....	12 1/4	24 1/4	38	61
Anaconda Copper.....	39 1/8	13 1/8	26	65
Standard Oil of New Jersey.....	47 1/4	31 1/4	16 1/4	33
Gulf Oil Co.....	66 1/4	45	21 1/4	32
Texas Corporation.....	32 1/4	16 1/4	16	49
General Motors.....	42 1/4	24 1/4	18 1/4	42
Chrysler Motor.....	21 1/4	14	7 1/4	34
Studebaker Co.....	23	12	11	47
General Foods.....	52 1/4	34 1/4	17 1/4	33
Standard Brands.....	18 1/4	14	4 1/4	25
Commercial Solvents.....	18 1/4	9 1/4	9 1/4	47
United States Industrial Alcohol.....	68 1/4	27 1/4	40 1/4	60
Paramount Public.....	44 1/4	11 1/4	32 1/4	73
Radio-Keith-Orpheum.....	19 1/4	2	17 1/4	89
Warner Bros. Pictures.....	13 1/4	3 1/4	9 1/4	71
Chase National Bank.....	102	30 1/4	62 1/4	61
Guaranty Trust Co.....	539	266	273	45
Irving Trust Co.....	39	20	19	48
Niagara Shares.....	8 1/4	3 1/4	5 1/4	57
United Founders.....	9	2 1/4	6 1/4	73
Goldman-Sachs.....	8 1/4	2 1/4	6 1/4	69

Mr. BLANTON. In that connection I want you to read again what the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] showed you the facts to be on last Saturday. Why did not those facts go to the people of the United States? I want the people of the United States to look in the RECORD for last Saturday, May 7, and read the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA]. They are entitled to it as a news source from the press of the United States.

I am doing a good day's work when I am causing it to go to 44,000 American citizens in every part of the United States in the RECORD to-morrow.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. LINTHICUM. With reference to what the gentleman just said, the people of this country do not seem to realize that Congress has reduced the salaries of Members of Congress \$825 each. The papers in my part of the State, at least, seem to think we have not made any reduction.

Mr. BLANTON. Every proposal that has been made here by the Democratic Party has been to reduce the salaries of Members of Congress along with the balance.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. The gentleman is always so interested in economy. I wonder if the gentleman realizes exactly how much he is costing the people of the United States to-day.

The RECORD costs \$60 a page to print, and the gentleman has already consumed several pages.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I have served longer in the House than has the lady from New Jersey. The expense of this Congress goes on just the same whether we talk or whether we do not talk. If we had not met at all to-day, the expenses would have gone on just the same.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Has the gentleman from Texas a right to quarrel with the lady chairman of the committee in public?

Mr. BLANTON. There is better feeling existing between myself and the Democratic chairman of every committee on my side than there is between the gentleman from Michigan and our Democratic chairman. He does not go along with them on important matters and I do go with them whenever they are right. [Laughter.]

I do go with them when they are right. [Laughter.] The lady's salary goes on whether we meet or whether we do not. Every employee of this House who is on a salary basis gets his salary just the same. Had we adjourned at 12 o'clock the expense of to-day would have been just exactly what the expenses will be, anyway, except for a little paper used in printing. In the Printing Office the employees are paid a salary by the year; they have their annual leave, their sick leave, and all the other perquisites which go with their jobs. It does not make any difference; they get their pay whether they print or they do not print.

Our good colleague the lady from New Jersey, as chairman of the District Committee, is peeved just now with me because we would not let her pass a lot of bills in a hurry here to-day. No Member here knows more about the business of the District Committee than I do, for I served as an active member on that committee for 10 years. I honestly believe, that excepting the Committee on Claims, more bad, unwise measures have been favorably reported to the House from the District Committee since it was created than from any other committee of the House during that time. It is my honest belief that it would be a great accomplishment if half of the District measures could be stopped and not passed.

We want to remember that just because a bill is favorably reported from a committee is no reason for us to believe that it is all right and should be passed. Every bad bill that has ever been passed by this Congress since its beginning has been a bill that was favorably reported by some committee. And whenever any Member opposed it the committee naturally did not like it.

I am performing a real service to my country in doing that hard, grinding work that is necessary to get these facts before the people of this country. That is the only way that they will ever force consolidations and abolishment of useless bureaus. It is absolutely necessary that the people should know the facts, and they can get the facts only through the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the money we spend for it gives the greatest value to the taxpayers.

The people should know this: The President of the United States last December brought us a Budget which was prepared especially under his direction, by his own agents selected by him. He could discharge them at will. They are supposed to obey his order to the letter. They are supposed to do just what he tells them, and nothing more. He could have told his Budget committee before he brought that Budget in here last December: "I do not want you to bring any estimates that aggregate over \$2,000,000,000." Is not that so?

Why did he not do that? Why did he not tell his subordinate agents who had to do his will not to bring in here a Budget that aggregated over \$2,000,000,000? But he did not. When that question was asked of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], he said, and I am quoting his exact language: "Why, he then did not know what the revenue would be."

Why, the President showed right on the fly leaf of his budget what the revenue would be. That was one contribution made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER]

in advance of my speech. The gentleman called your attention to what the President said right on the fly page of the Budget as to what the revenues would be for 1933.

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry, but I can not. I decline to yield.

Who is responsible for the bringing in of a Budget of nearly \$4,000,000,000? Mr. Hoover; nobody but Mr. Hoover. Had he wanted to economize, why did he not do it last December when he brought us a big Budget?

What did your leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], say about conditions? The gentleman said they were not the same. I said: "There were 7,000,000 heads of families walking the streets last December without jobs," and he said that was not so. Now, I want the people of the United States to pass on whether I am correct or whether your leader, Mr. SNELL, is correct. Is there anybody here who will deny that there were approximately 7,000,000 people without jobs in the United States last December? I want to see who it is who will deny that on the floor.

I yield to you if you will deny it. You know you can not deny it. That is a fact. Then, why did Mr. SNELL deny it? Why was he not frank? Why did he not stand up here like BERT SNELL usually does, 2-fisted, the front of his shoulders straight, and say, "Why, that is true," because it was true?

If the President knew the conditions last December, why did he have his Budget bring in an estimate here for about \$4,000,000,000? Then I called his attention to the economies effected by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BYRNS].

Mr. BYRNS put in the RECORD bill after bill. He showed what the President estimated he wanted; he then showed what our committee gave and what the savings had amounted to already. He showed that what we had saved already amounted to \$161,000,000. Mr. SNELL said they were not the correct savings. Well, now, let me call the country's attention to this. I am putting this in the RECORD for the country. I want this to go to the country. It will not go in any of the newspapers. It does show that we have already saved \$161,000,000 and that we have cut that sum below Budget estimates bill by bill. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read the bill for amendment.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7305) to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF THE SALE OF SECURITIES WITHIN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9065) to supervise and regulate the sale of securities within the District of Columbia. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The lady from New Jersey calls up a bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The lady from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to 30 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a very important bill. It has been considered by the District Committee for many years. I think it contains many features that are detrimental to the welfare of the people of the District. I would like to have some time on the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. I will be glad to yield 15 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Fifteen minutes will not be enough time on a bill like this. This is a bill containing 32 pages. It has been before the District Committee for many years. At one time I was on the subcommittee which had the bill under consideration.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, to save time, I object.

The SPEAKER. The lady from New Jersey moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9065.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9065) with Mr. THOMASON in the Chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, known as H. R. 9065, is one of the most important bills that has been considered during any session of Congress. It is a bill to regulate the sale of securities, stocks, and bonds in the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia has just recently passed through an era of fraudulent sales and transactions of worthless securities. Millions and millions of dollars have been invested and lost by innocent purchasers in bonds, stocks, and securities upon representations of unscrupulous and unprincipled brokers and salesmen in the District of Columbia. That condition is evidenced by the long chain of suicides, bankruptcies, and insolvencies that have followed in the wake of these investments. Securities have been pyramided upon worthless properties and have been sold to the public as bona fide and well-secured bonds and stocks, and the people in the District of Columbia have suffered by reason of these fraudulent manipulations and transactions.

That condition has been brought about primarily because there was no law in the District of Columbia to prevent the sale of worthless securities. There was only one remedy in the District of Columbia against fraudulent transactions, and that was the criminal statute which could be applied only after the offense had been committed. There was no law in the District of Columbia to prevent the fraud. There is a law in the Criminal Code which provides for the arrest, prosecution, and conviction of those who would defraud the public; but there is no law in the District of Columbia that permits the detection or prevention of fraud.

Those in the District of Columbia who conceived the idea of defrauding the public by the sale of worthless securities went into nearly every State of the Union and qualified under the blue sky laws of those States. The securities were approved and permission was granted to sell worthless securities and stocks under the apparent protection of the blue sky laws. The citizens of the District of Columbia realized that some protection should be afforded the innocent purchasers and likewise some protection should be afforded the investment houses or the investment bankers who were doing an honest business in the District of Columbia. Consequently, the people of the District of Columbia have almost unanimously presented this bill for your consideration. It is modeled after the protective laws of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

There are two methods of regulating and preventing the sale of worthless securities. One is by licensing the securities themselves. This is known as the blue sky law. The

operation of the blue sky law has not prevented the fraudulent sale of worthless securities; in fact, any party who desires to defraud the public conceals the fraud when he goes before the blue sky commission in an effort to have the blue sky commission of any State approve the securities.

This bill does not regulate nor legalize the approval of securities. It offers the second method of regulating the sales of securities by injunction. It provides for the licensing of dealers and sales agents of securities. It requires sales agents and dealers to present to the commissioner of insurance all facts and data concerning the securities which they wish to sell in the District of Columbia. If the salesman or dealer has been convicted in the District of Columbia or in any competent court of the United States, he is denied the privilege of qualifying or registering as a salesman until two years have elapsed since the date of conviction. If the evidence shows, on his application, that a salesman or dealer has been convicted in fraudulent sales of securities or has been enjoined by any court twice, then he is prevented from registering under this proposed act.

These provisions provide an adequate remedy for the people of the District of Columbia. If any citizen in the District of Columbia or anywhere in the United States has any reason to believe that the securities being sold in any jurisdiction of the United States are worthless, then that citizen has the right to call the attention of the commissioner of insurance of the District of Columbia to that particular fact. The insurance commissioner then has this right or power to call in the agent who has been registered as a salesman of securities in the District of Columbia and may then question him, and if he refuses to submit to the commissioner of insurance the facts and data required of him, the commissioner may revoke his license or his registration. Not only this, but if the commissioner of insurance believes at any time, from the evidence submitted to him, that the agent is selling worthless securities or that he is practicing fraud upon the public, he may go into court and have an injunction issued against him and prevent the sale of these worthless securities. Not only this; if conditions justify, he may appoint a receiver for all of the assets of the agent or the copartnership or the corporation that is handling the securities, and thus preserve for the people the tangible property and the assets that can be found.

Recently in the District of Columbia the public heard numerous mutterings and grumbings concerning certain great investment corporations and certain individuals who were engaged in the sale of securities and stocks in the District of Columbia. At that time people were advised that the securities offered for sale by these companies and individuals were worthless, but the hands of the people in the District of Columbia were tied. Nothing could be done until after the offense or the crime had been committed.

Had we had this securities legislation on the statute books of the District of Columbia, it would have been an easy matter for the people of the District of Columbia to have gone to the commissioner of insurance and asked for an investigation of these securities that were being offered on the market. Millions upon millions of dollars could have been saved in the District of Columbia; but there was no law, and it has been proven since that these people actually defrauded the citizens of the District of Columbia, and many of them are suffering to-day the penalty for their acts.

Now, I want this to be borne in mind. The passage of this law does not create a new bureau for the purpose of passing upon securities. Without a single outlay or without a single penny of additional appropriation this bill may be put into force and effect and into complete operation without a moment's delay.

The bill provides that the commissioner of insurance shall handle all these matters, and despite the fact the report shows that the income from the administration of this bill will be something like \$50,000, I want to make a correction of that amount, because that is a typographical error. It will bring into the District something like \$5,000, which will be amply sufficient to pay for the additional help necessary in the office of the commissioner of insurance.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. It is not provided in the measure that the commissioner can act upon his own initiative. He has to wait until some one makes a complaint, does he not?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes; the commissioner can act upon any information or may make the investigation himself. When a man submits an application to the commissioner for the right to sell stocks and securities he fills out a questionnaire and sets forth his employment during the last five years. If he can qualify under the provisions of this bill, the matter is not discretionary with the commissioner of insurance. He must issue the permit.

Mr. COLE of Iowa. Would it not be better if the commissioner could act upon his own initiative and prevent these securities from being sold if he has reason to doubt their value?

Mr. BOWMAN. I will state that he can act on his own initiative. When the application is filed, the agent must submit all data concerning class of securities, stocks, and bonds he desires to sell to the public.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWMAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice on page 10, section 4 of the bill, it says:

Each person registered as a dealer (except a licensed real-estate broker) shall pay to said superintendent for the use of the District of Columbia a fee of \$50—

And so forth. Does this bill carry a provision for licensing real-estate brokers?

Mr. BOWMAN. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Then why this particular language?

Mr. BOWMAN. That language is used for the purpose of exempting real-estate brokers from the sale of real estate. Real estate is different from the sale of stocks and bonds.

Mr. PATMAN. Then real estate is not considered in connection with the bill?

Mr. BOWMAN. No.

Mr. ARENTZ. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. The applicant must state what he has been doing for the past five years; and if that is satisfactory, he gets a license, and can start in selling securities of any kind.

Mr. BOWMAN. No; the gentleman misunderstands. When the applicant is licensed, he must also submit to the commissioner of insurance the character and kind of stocks and bonds and securities which he is to sell.

Mr. ARENTZ. But during the year which the license runs when a new stock comes out, he can sell it, or must the insurance commissioner wait until some complaint is made?

Mr. BOWMAN. The commissioner may require him to come again and submit a new proposition of the stock he is to sell.

Mr. ARENTZ. After he has got rid of some of the new stocks or bonds.

Mr. BOWMAN. No.

Mr. ARENTZ. How is the insurance commissioner going to anticipate that the dealer is to sell these new stocks and bonds?

Mr. BOWMAN. There is no law that will prevent fraud.

Mr. TILSON. Would it not be possible to provide that a security salesman should not sell any securities until he had left a description of those securities with the insurance commissioner? Would it not be possible to require him before he could sell at all to leave a description of all securities he intends to sell with the insurance commissioner?

Mr. BOWMAN. The law requires the salesman to submit to the insurance commissioner all of his advertising data concerning the stock he has for sale.

Mr. TILSON. So he could not go to-morrow and take up some new stock that he had never submitted to the commissioner, and sell it?

Mr. BOWMAN. No; it goes along in the regular way—in other words, the matter of the sale of stocks and securities is

kept entirely within the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance in the District of Columbia.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is one provision in the bill which strikes me askance. That is that you grant to a dealer or salesman the privilege of a license after he has been convicted once. If he has once been convicted of being a crook, why should the man be given another chance to mulct the public?

Mr. BOWMAN. That is along the general line of giving a man another chance. It does arouse the suspicion of the superintendent of insurance and will enable him to keep a better guard over securities than otherwise.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman know of any other law where after a man is proven to be a crook and dupes the public, they give him another chance to do the same thing?

Mr. BOWMAN. We have a lot of crooks who are going back into business.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; but in a case where the public generally is not at stake; but in this instance you allow this man the safeguard of a certificate after he has been convicted, permitting him to go out and again mulct the public.

Mr. BOWMAN. But the gentleman will understand that this certificate is not issued him until two years after he has served his conviction.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the certificate does not bear any stripes upon it to let the public know that he has been once convicted of this particular offense.

Mr. BOWMAN. The superintendent would have ample opportunity to investigate the life and character of the man since he served his sentence.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there are many other avenues whereby he could make a livelihood without giving him another chance to gyp the public in this way.

Mr. ARENTZ. Does not the public have the right to look at the history of each applicant?

Mr. BOWMAN. Yes.

Mr. ARENTZ. If that is true, I think that what the gentleman from Wisconsin says has no bearing.

Mr. BOWMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill. I am not very familiar with this particular bill and have not had time to give it careful consideration. I rise to make a few suggestions relating to it which I think the membership of the House should consider before passing this class of legislation. In the Seventy-first Congress a similar bill was introduced and I, as one member of the subcommittee which had charge of the legislation, concluded that instead of its being a bill to protect the public, it would come nearer to protecting the people who wanted to defraud the public.

Mr. BOWMAN. The gentleman would not make that statement against the people who appeared in favor of this bill?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; I do not say that in reference to the people who favored it, or anything about those people. I am just telling what my conclusions were after analyzing the other bill, and if I am not mistaken the gentleman from West Virginia himself more or less agreed with me and we killed the bill.

Mr. BOWMAN. But this is the first time this bill has ever been presented.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; this particular bill, and the only reason I look with suspicion upon this bill is because of the provisions in the other bill which had for its purpose doing the same thing. A good purpose was expressed. It is stated by the gentleman from West Virginia that millions could have been saved the people of the District if they had had some kind of a commission to pass on the securities that were sold to them some two or three years ago in the District of Columbia. I presume he has reference to those securities that were sold which had as collateral certain

apartment houses and hotels here in the District of Columbia. It is true that possibly if some one had passed on those securities, some people would have been helped; I do not know, but possibly others would have been harmed. Whenever you grant to a commission or to one person the duty, obligation, and privilege of passing on what people can sell or buy in any locality, you are just as likely to cause a detriment to be imposed on those people as you are to give them a benefit. I say that advisedly. After investigating blue sky laws in many States, I discovered that people who sold fraudulent securities will get into the good graces of the officials. Of course, these officials are not corrupt or dishonest, and they do not mean to do anything wrong, but these people will be able to persuade these officials that certain securities come within the law and should be permitted to be sold in that particular locality.

The commission will put its O. K. on the sale of those securities in that locality. Then these people will advertise to the public that they have the stamp of approval of the commission, that they are bound to have a proposition that is worth while, that is good, and that will protect the investing public, or the commission naturally would never have approved the sale of the securities. I notice in this particular bill a provision that they shall not be allowed to advertise the fact that they have obtained the consent of the superintendent of insurance to sell the securities. If it is such a good proposition and if it is such a safe way of handling securities, why should they not be permitted to advertise it? Of course the inference will be drawn from the fact that they are being sold in the locality that they have received the approval of the District of Columbia officials or they would not be selling them. On page 15, section 5, why did the gentleman from West Virginia deny them the privilege of advertising that they had secured the approval of the District officials?

Mr. BOWMAN. Just for the same reason.

Mr. PATMAN. All right. That answers the question.

Mr. BOWMAN. Let me answer the question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman said, "For the same reason," and, of course, I mentioned the reason a while ago.

Mr. BOWMAN. In the blue sky law States are permitted to stamp their approval upon these securities.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman believe that if this bill becomes law and securities are offered for sale in the District of Columbia, the citizen will have a right to presume they have been O. K'd by the superintendent of insurance in the District?

Mr. BOWMAN. I presume so.

Mr. PATMAN. Why not stamp it on there then?

Mr. BOWMAN. But the citizen of the District of Columbia may appeal to the superintendent of insurance and may make complaint to the superintendent.

Mr. PATMAN. Why make complaint? They have securities that are permitted to be sold. There is no complaint to be made.

Mr. BOWMAN. Oh, the gentleman knows this is to protect the citizen against fraud. We are not protecting citizens against the legitimate man who sells honest stocks and honest securities.

Mr. PATMAN. Why pass this legislation if the intent is not to prevent fraud?

Mr. BOWMAN. I did not say it was not to prevent fraud.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, the gentleman said fraud could not be prevented.

Mr. BOWMAN. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that at all. There is no statute, there is no law that will prevent fraud. The gentleman understands that. But this is legislation to detect it. It is to give the strong arm of the law to the insurance department so that it can go into court and protect the citizens of the District of Columbia, if there is an attempt to defraud them.

Mr. PATMAN. If the criminal law of the District of Columbia is not sufficient to do that thing to-day, why not amend the criminal law?

Mr. BOWMAN. The criminal law can not protect until a crime has been committed.

Mr. PATMAN. In this case, you will be leaving it to one or two men to say who shall sell securities and who shall not, and what kind of securities shall be sold and what kind of securities shall not be sold. That is a great deal of authority and power to give any one person or any one board in the District of Columbia or elsewhere. May I ask the gentleman to take into consideration the fact that, although the gentleman says this is not setting up a new board or bureau or commission, page 19 of the bill provides as follows:

Assistants to superintendent.

Which is another way of creating another board or commission.

Section 8 reads:

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia may appoint and employ such additional assistants—

How many? The number is not stated. Is it a dozen, a hundred, or two hundred? The number is not stated—

such number of assistants to the superintendent of insurance for the District of Columbia as may be necessary to carry into effect and enforce the provisions of this act.

If it will take a dozen, that is all right; it is left up to the board. If it will take 200, that is all right; it is left up to the board; or 500.

Mr. HARLAN. Will the gentleman read the next paragraph?

Mr. PATMAN (reading):

Provided that the necessary funds therefor shall be appropriated in any annual or supplemental appropriation act.

Certainly. They will make a contract with these people and then come here and say, "You pay the money." They have always done that, and they will do it in the future.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. They can not make a contract to employ anybody until they actually have the money, can they?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly they can, if they have the power to do it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. They may employ somebody, but if they do not have the funds to pay that person, how are they going to employ them?

Mr. PATMAN. It gives them the right to employ these persons.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. But that is subject to an appropriation, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Well, there must be an appropriation.

Mr. PATMAN. Then they will come with this pressure before the Committee on Appropriations "You gave them authority to employ such assistants, and they need, in order to carry the act into effect, this many employees. We want you to employ them and pay them. We can not carry the act into effect unless you do." You would be under obligation to carry in an appropriation bill, the necessary funds to pay them.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I live a thousand miles from here, but nevertheless, securities which proved to be absolutely of no value, were sold from Washington in my district, a thousand miles from here.

Mr. PATMAN. And they will continue to be sold after this law is enacted.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. This is the blue sky law, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I presume it is.

Mr. BOWMAN. No; it is not.

Mr. PATMAN. But it is not always the blue sky law that protects the investor. Sometimes it protects the people who are defrauding the investors.

This section 8 reads further:

The said superintendent may specify the authority, duties, and designations of his assistants, and all things done by any of his assistants in carrying into effect provisions of this act shall have the same legal effect as if done by the said superintendent in person.

The said superintendent of insurance, his assistants and clerks, shall not impart any information obtained by them in the course of any examination or investigation, except as may be necessary in the performance of their duties.

Now, although that does not specifically state that a board is created or that a commission is created, yet it gives the board the power to employ any number of assistants it desires to employ and pay them such salaries as they desire to pay them for their services. There is no limit on it.

They will get the money through appropriation bills here in Congress. You gentlemen know the pressure that will be brought to bear in order to get the money appropriated. You have had experiences in cases like this in the past. They will tell you: "Now, you want to eliminate fraud in the District; you have passed a law to eliminate fraud; you have placed the burden upon our shoulders to carry into effect the provisions of the act. In order to do that we have employed certain experts for certain purposes, and have agreed and contracted to pay them certain salaries. Now, then, you give us an appropriation that is sufficient to pay those salaries."

Why, it would be an unanswerable argument. It is always made here. It is made every session; and I do not know whether this will cost \$10,000 extra, or \$100,000 extra. Possibly in a few years it would cost a million dollars, I do not know, and no one else knows.

There are entirely too many commissions here now, too many officers having too much authority, and the people have been robbed because of the unlimited authority of certain officers of the United States Government.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a brief question.

Mr. HARLAN. Does the gentleman believe in the supervision of protection of people in the matter of selling securities?

Mr. PATMAN. I believe in protecting the people by criminal laws, and putting the ones who violate the law into the penitentiaries of this Nation.

Mr. HARLAN. Then, the stand of the gentleman from Texas is that neither licensing the broker nor approving the security is correct; the gentleman does not approve either of those measures?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know that that is material. I am against unlimited authority to employ assistants. Is the gentleman from Ohio in favor of that?

Mr. HARLAN. I am in favor of protecting the purchasers of securities in the District of Columbia. The gentleman's contention is that there must be an actual crime committed and people actually defrauded before the commissioners can take any step at all; is that right?

Mr. PATMAN. I am willing to amend the criminal laws of the District of Columbia in any way possible in order to convict and send to the penitentiary people who defraud the investing public in the District of Columbia [applause], but I am not in favor of turning over to one man, or any group of men, unlimited power and authority to say who shall sell securities and who shall not sell securities, and state what kind of securities shall be sold, and what kind of securities shall not be sold. That is going too far.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BOWMAN. The superintendent of insurance does not have the discretionary power to determine who shall sell securities in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PATMAN. But they must be licensed.

Mr. BOWMAN. They must qualify.

Mr. PATMAN. They must be registered.

Mr. HARLAN. He has no discretion with respect to that.

Mr. PALMISANO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a short question.

Mr. PALMISANO. May I ask the gentleman from Texas whether or not in Texas there is an insurance commissioner who O. K's the sale or issuance of policies?

Mr. PATMAN. We have a blue sky law that has caused a lot of our people plenty of trouble.

Mr. PALMISANO. Does that apply in Texas?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it applied in Texas. In the States that have blue sky laws they go in there, get approval of powers to sell certain securities, and when they get the O. K., they go out and sell the securities and people would buy them, expecting to get good securities when they were not good securities, and the people would buy them because of certain recommendations made by State officials, or because the blue-sky board gave them their approval.

Mr. PALMISANO. Is it not true in all the States—

Mr. PATMAN. I am not entirely familiar with the State laws.

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BOWMAN. The State of Texas has a blue sky law. In other words, before you can sell stocks or securities in the State of Texas it is necessary for the officials of the State to stamp their approval on those securities, and therein lies the danger of fraud.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not yield any further. The gentleman has had his time, and I want to take my time. You say you must not stamp on any literature, on any advertisement, or make any reference to the fact that this board has approved these securities. Suppose a security salesman offers you a security. You want to purchase that security. There is nothing to indicate that he has a right to sell that security in the District of Columbia. The first inquiry you would make would be, "Have you a license to sell this security?" "Yes; I have a license." All right; you would look at the license, and that would be the same thing as a stamp of approval upon the securities themselves.

AN OFFICIAL WHO IS DRUNK WITH POWER

I want to show you what was done by another officer of the United States Government who was drunk on power. I would call it drunk on power. I had a letter from a banker not many miles from Washington. He says if there was ever a man drunk on power it is Mr. Pole, the Comptroller of the Currency. He says:

This gentleman's ideas would probably work in flourishing times, but not in a depression such as we now have.

I am going to use this case as an illustration of what could happen here. There was passed in this body in February of 1927 what was known as a branch banking law. Of course, there was another provision in that law that did not relate to branch banking at all, but there was very little discussion on the floor of the House as to that feature of the bill. There was much said about branch banking, but very little said about this provision, which gave the Comptroller of the Currency the right to define what constitutes an investment security. The bill went through. If I had been a Member of Congress at that time, I would not have seen any good and valid reason why it should not have gone through. I do not criticize any Member for voting for the bill or any member of the committee for letting it go through. It appeared to be an innocent and harmless provision as an amendment to our present banking laws. It was an amendment providing that section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, subsection seventh thereof, be further amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following:

Provided, That the business of buying and selling investment securities shall hereafter be limited to buying and selling without recourse marketable obligations evidencing indebtedness of any person, copartnership, association, or corporation, in the form of bonds, notes, and/or debentures, commonly known as investment securities—

Listen to this:

As may by regulation be prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency.

In other words, it was left up to the Comptroller of the Currency to define what constitutes an investment security.

Under this law of 1927 let us see what the comptroller did under similar circumstances, a man who would have no more power than you are giving under the bill before us to-day. Here is what the comptroller did. He defined what constitutes an investment security. Now, listen when I read this definition and see if the definition does not exclude local

securities. It encourages banks to squeeze out local borrowers in order that he may have that money and buy investment securities such as are described by the Comptroller of the Currency in his order. Here is what the order contained, and it was issued as of June 30, 1927:

SERIES 1. REGULATIONS FURTHER DEFINING THE TERM "INVESTMENT SECURITIES" AS USED IN THE ACT APPROVED FEBRUARY 25, 1927

By virtue of the authority vested in the Comptroller of the Currency by the terms of section 2 (b) of the act approved February 25, 1927, the following regulations further defining the term "investment securities" are prescribed:

1. The business of buying and selling investment securities by national banks is governed by section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by an act to further amend the national banking laws and the Federal reserve act, and for other purposes, as approved February 25, 1927, as follows:

"(b) That section 5136 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, subsection 'seventh' thereof, be further amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following:

"Provided, That the business of buying and selling investment securities shall hereafter be limited to buying and selling without recourse marketable obligations evidencing indebtedness of any person, copartnership, association, or corporation, in the form of bonds, notes and/or debentures, commonly known as investment securities, under such further definition of the term 'investment securities' as may by regulation be prescribed by the Comptroller of the Currency, and the total amount of such investment securities of any one obligor or maker held by such association shall at no time exceed 25 per cent of the amount of the capital stock of such association actually paid in and unimpaired and 25 per cent of its unimpaired surplus fund, but this limitation as to total amount shall not apply to obligations of the United States, or general obligations of any State or of any political subdivision thereof, or obligations issued under authority of the Federal farm loan act."

2. An obligation of indebtedness which may be bought and sold by national banks, in order to come within the classification of "investment securities" within the meaning of the proviso of section 5136 above quoted, must be a marketable security as designated by the express language of said proviso. Under ordinary circumstances the term "marketable" means that the security in question has such a market as to render sales at intrinsic values readily possible.

3. In classifying a given security as marketable, the Comptroller of the Currency may in specific cases give consideration to various facts and circumstances, but he will require in all cases the following:

(a) That the issue be of a sufficiently large total to make marketability possible.

(b) Such a public distribution of the securities must have been provided for or made in a manner to protect or insure the marketability of the issue.

(c) That the trust agreement under which the security is issued provides for a trustee independent of the obligor and in the case of securities issued under a trust agreement executed and delivered after 60 days from the date of the promulgation of these regulations, such a trustee must be a bank or trust company.

4. This series of regulations may be modified, amended, or withdrawn at any time by the Comptroller of the Currency.

Signed and promulgated this 30th day of June, 1927.

J. W. McINTOSH,

Comptroller of the Currency.

He sent a copy of this order to every national-bank examiner in this country and it was sent to all of the national banks. At that time they were encouraged to build up their secondary reserve. It is a fallacy, but they were encouraged to build up a secondary reserve. A banker would ask a bank examiner, "What can I invest my extra funds in?" "Well," the bank examiner would say, "read the comptroller's order. He tells you what constitutes an investment security." The banker would ask him about a certain security and the bank examiner would say, "Well, I will not tell you about certain things. You just take into consideration the rules laid down by the Comptroller of the Currency." And he has never amended those rules. They are effective to-day. Consequently, when some one would come in and want to borrow some money on local securities, on a local building or a local business institution, he would get out his order and say, "Well, that does not come within the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency. The order says:

That the issue be of a sufficiently large total to make marketability possible.

Such a public distribution of the securities must have been provided for or made in a manner to protect or insure the marketability of the issue.

In other words, something that is sold all over the Nation by these groups of bankers.

You read their advertisements. Those securities would come within the terms of this order and other securities would not come within the terms of the order. Consequently, these small bankers—and I doubt that they should be criticized or censured for it because they were acting in compliance with orders issued from Washington—invested their funds in these securities that were recommended to them by the agents of the international banks who would follow in the footsteps of the bank examiner. When the bank examiner would leave, the agent would come in and say, "Let me sell you some securities to build up a secondary reserve." The banker would say, "Do your securities come within the terms of this order," and they would reply, "Certainly; here is the order and here are the securities. You see, they are handled by a number of banks, the Chase National and all these other large banks of the Nation are selling them, and that causes them to come within this order with respect to wide distribution. They are posted on the exchanges every day and you can tell what they are worth. You take John Jones's paper, although it is good, you can not get up in the morning and look in any daily paper and tell how much that paper is worth because it is not listed. With this paper you can do that. So the idea is to squeeze out John Jones and invest in some of these marketable securities as defined by the regulations of the Comptroller of the Currency."

LOCAL PEOPLE SUFFERED

What happened? They squeezed out local people and that money went to New York. Lots of it went into foreign bonds sold to these bankers for 100 cents on the dollar, and these agents of the international bankers would tell these other bankers, and one of them told me so: "These securities are so good that not only should you invest all your idle funds in such securities, but your directors should get together and put all the money they can get into them. Not many more are going to be offered. Here are good Colombian bonds drawing 6 per cent."

They took the advice of the representatives of the international banks about these bonds, and now some of them are selling for 7 cents on the dollar and they are some of the marketable securities that the Comptroller of the Currency had so much to say about.

I do not know but what this had a great deal to do with the crash in 1929. Here was the Comptroller of the Currency stimulating speculation. He was encouraging the issuance of these foreign bonds and other securities that would come within his definition. He was encouraging the withdrawal of money from the local banks of the Nation and putting that money into a few banks in New York. Do you not think that contributed to the collapse in 1929? Remember that what I am telling you now was just started in September, 1927.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman will remember that the F. H. Smith Co., of which Mr. Fred Zihlman, who used to be a member of the District Committee and the chairman of it, was a former director and a high officer, pyramided its securities on property and sold them all over the country when they were not worth 2 cents on the dollar, and this bankrupted a great many people here.

Mr. PATMAN. That is very true. I do not know about the value of the stocks or the securities that were offered, but I know a great many people were defrauded by reason of the sale of those securities; and what evidence have we before us that this board would not have approved the sale of those securities under the circumstances under which they were offered?

Mr. BLANTON. It was one of the leading firms in this city, with a Member of Congress and a chairman of one of the important committees holding high office in the company. Of course, they could have received such approval under a bill such as this.

Mr. PATMAN. In 1927, if they had got such approval, they would have then gone to the people with the O. K. of an investigating body, and they would have said: "Very

seldom do you have the opportunity of purchasing securities that have been investigated by some disinterested party or parties; an investigation paid for by public funds, but in this case your public officials have investigated these securities and have found them to be sound and have recommended to the investing public of the District of Columbia that they purchase them, and now we offer them for sale."

Mr. BOWMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BOWMAN. Did these international bonds or securities come within the jurisdiction of the blue sky laws?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the way they were sold they would not have to go before any local board. They would deliver them by mail and they would not be caught under this proposed act.

Mr. BLANTON. With respect to securities they sell out of the District of Columbia, under this bill they do not even have to have them registered or passed upon. All they have to do is to get a license and then they sell them indiscriminately and promiscuously everywhere.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to tell you something more about this order of the Comptroller of the Currency.

In 1927, when the comptroller issued the investment order, railroad bonds immediately commenced a downward trend. Interest rates were too low. So did 28 textiles and 8 stocks of sugar producing and refining companies; fertilizer, four of the big stocks, up slightly, but very small, and then downward. Here is an index of 90 stocks that went upward immediately after July, 1929.

Bank stock went up immediately. Crude-petroleum prices went downward. So with gasoline prices. Cotton prices went down and cotton goods.

Why, there was every incentive to invest your money in some of these securities that the Comptroller of the Currency said were good securities, and they were drawing 6 and 8 per cent interest annually. Why should they invest their money with local people on unlisted securities and get a low interest rate, or invest it in local enterprises where the dividends were not so large as dividends from the securities that came within the Comptroller of the Currency's order?

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman know whether the comptroller's provisions came within the terms of any specific foreign security?

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman takes the position that if these foreign securities had not been bought, and that that large amount of money was still in this country, we would not have had the depression?

Mr. PATMAN. Probably the depression would never have come. The incentive was to take the money out of the local banks, send it to New York, invest it in these securities, which the Comptroller of the Currency stated were good securities, as he recommended under the order of regulation issued June 27.

To my mind that order did more to cause this depression, to cause this collapse, to cause the distress and suffering that we have to-day than any other one contributing factor.

Mr. BLACK. The gentleman says that in connection with our helping the Federal reserve banks in the gold situation?

Mr. PATMAN. This was in 1927. Let me tell you something about these Colombian bonds. Certain people in the United States purchased an invalid concession—not a valid concession, but an invalid concession. It was canceled. They knew it had been canceled when they purchased it. It was purchased by Mellon and Morgan.

When they made that purchase, they had just as well have said, "We can make them validate this concession. We will take it, although it has been canceled. We will get it validated."

They took the invalidated concession, said to be worth \$2,000,000,000—and what did they do? That South American Republic, Colombia, ratified it and validated it before they could get loans through the Wall Street banks. That

is what they did. Part of the money loaned to that country was withheld until the concession was ratified by the Colombian Congress.

To-day they hold that concession, estimated to be worth \$2,000,000,000, by reason of the pressure brought to bear on the Colombian Government.

I remember reading an article headed "My Brother and I." I do not remember who wrote the article, but anyone can find out. It said in this article that Mellon and his brother have been said to control \$8,000,000,000 worth of property, but it is only \$7,950,000,000 worth of this world's goods.

It lacks \$50,000,000 of being \$8,000,000,000 worth of wealth. I do not know how much he was worth when he finally consented to become Secretary of the Treasury, but it was estimated that he and his brother were worth around \$500,000,000. As to where the difference came in between \$500,000,000 and \$8,000,000,000 from March 4, 1921, to the time he was pardoned by President Hoover in 1932, I do not know, but that doubtless concessions, amounting to \$2,000,000,000 from one country at one time, would add greatly to that enhanced wealth.

MELLON AND MILLS DISQUALIFIED

Men like Andrew W. Mellon or Mr. Ogden Livingston Mills should not be permitted to hold the office of Secretary of the Treasury. Their policies and interests disqualify them. And, too, they are men who inherited their wealth from fathers and grandfathers. They have never wanted for anything in their lives. Not only are they assured of everything they desire during their lifetime, but they have sufficient property to enable their descendants for the next 5 or 10 generations to live in luxury without the turning of a hand. They are not in a position to sympathize with the working people. The Secretary of the Treasury controls the supply of money. It is to their interest to make the supply short, so money will be higher and commodities and labor cheap.

THE MELLONS' WEALTH

Mr. Mellon and his brother owned and controlled about \$500,000,000 worth of property when he became Secretary of the Treasury. When he was pardoned by the President for illegally holding office, from 1921 to 1932, Mr. Mellon and his brother owned and controlled approximately \$8,000,000,000 worth of property. The property is itemized in an article entitled "My Brother and I" in the World's Work Magazine for March, 1932.

CONFLICTING INTERESTS

We will presume that Mr. Mellon always considered a question from the standpoint of the public welfare when his own interests were involved. Almost daily his own business interests conflicted with a public duty he was charged with performing as Secretary of the Treasury. For instance, if he should rule that a certain taxpayer is entitled to a small tax refund for the year 1918, he would probably find that ruling cited as an authority for giving one of his own companies millions of dollars for the same year. He and his companies did receive large refunds from the Treasury Department while he was Secretary of the Treasury. The refunds were made in secret and the records are not subject to inspection.

SECRET TAX SYSTEM

Furthermore, let it be understood that I do not accuse Mr. Mellon of dishonesty. I have no right to. The records and facts are all secret and nobody can see them. He made enormous tax refunds to his own companies, and many refunds to himself. Could you go down there and find out how much he gave himself? Yes. But why he did so is a secret. Could you find out that he gave one of his companies \$3,000,000 at one time and another company \$1,500,000 at another time on the pretense—I presume it was true; I have no right to dispute—that they had overpaid their income tax back in 1917 and 1918? You could find out that he has done it, but why is it a secret; and you can not find it out, I do not care if you are a representative of the people, for you have no right to go down there and look at these records, and they will not let you see those records,

and this tax secrecy is at least partly responsible for this big deficit in the Treasury that we have to-day. Many of the refunds would not have been made if the records were subject to public inspection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. My colleague has sufficiently punished him, because, as Napoleon was banished to the island of St. Helena, so has my colleague banished Mellon to the island of the Court of St. James.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Can not the Joint Commission on Taxation secure the information the gentleman refers to?

Mr. PATMAN. Where the refund is over \$75,000 they have a right to examine the cases, but under \$75,000 they have not.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. But the gentleman has been talking about millions.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me tell you what actually happened. Take the matter of the United States Steel Corporation. They filed an application for a tax refund for 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, and 1921, practically every year. That was not allowed until 10 years and 11 months later, and then how many records did they have in those cases? Six truck loads, and they were all delivered to the committee at one time and the committee was told that they should find out if they could where a mistake had been made.

Why, it would take from now until doomsday to examine those cases. There should be some way that interested parties could keep up with what is going on. Why wait until six truck loads of records are accumulated before they are passed on and say to the companies, "Here is \$100,000,000, and, in addition to that, 6 per cent interest, not from 1925 but from 1917 and 1918"? In some instances the interest amounted to almost as much as the principal.

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

A lot has been said lately in the newspapers about secrecy in government. We have tax laws that are secretly administered. The taxes are paid in secret and the money is refunded in secret. Do you believe that our Government should administer its tax laws in that manner so that a taxpayer or even a representative of the people can not find out whether or not the laws are legally administered? I do not believe that you would say that that is a fair way to administer the tax law. I do not believe that you would say that any official of our Government should have the power to pay out millions and millions of dollars without any public inspection of the public records.

ARE CLERK'S RECORDS SECRET?

I have noticed in newspapers recently that the Clerk's records of this House are considered secret. I never heard of that before. One newspaper in my district said that a newspaper reporter had been trying to find out whom Congressmen had on the pay roll. He said he went to the Clerk and the Clerk said that the records were secret. I do not believe those records are secret and I doubt the Clerk telling him they were secret. I believe they are public records and public records should be open to public inspection; and if there is any rule or regulation that makes them secret that rule or regulation should be canceled because it is not right. Public funds should be administered subject to public inspection.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. The Clerk of the House of Representatives makes a report to Congress annually, and in that report he shows what employees drew salaries as employees of the House of Representatives for the entire fiscal year, and the gentleman can secure it in the document room.

Mr. BLANTON. And it is a public record open to everybody.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Certainly.

ANY TAXPAYER SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO INSPECT THE RECORDS

Mr. PATMAN. The criticism in one newspaper was that the information was withheld so long that it was almost without interest when it was received, but I see no reason why every month's record should not be published. I do

not think any Member of Congress would object to that. There is no reason why he should. Public money should be expended in a manner that will be subject to public inspection, and any taxpayer of the Nation should be privileged to inspect the record.

Mr. BLACK. The most secret conferences ever held in Washington are the meetings of the Cabinet. Try to find out what happens in the Cabinet meeting.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the newspaper boys do that all the time. They let us know the next day what happens in the Cabinet meeting.

Relative to the annual report of the Clerk, if my colleague will look back, he will see that I was the author of the legislation that requires the Clerk of the House of Representatives to print a public annual report showing in itemized detail all of the moneys received by him, and all of the disbursements made by him, both as to salaries under his jurisdiction and the current expenses of the House of Representatives. This report is a public document, and is open to the inspection of any citizen of the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a copy of a letter which the Comptroller of the Currency would send to anyone making inquiry as to what constituted an investment security within the terms of his order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

Your letter of — is received, inclosing circular with respect to —, and requesting to be advised whether they would be a lawful investment for a national bank.

The eligibility of securities as "investment securities" for national banks is governed by section 5138, United States Revised Statutes, as amended by the act of February 25, 1927, and the regulations of this office dated June 30, 1927, a copy of which is inclosed, further defining the term "investment securities."

You can readily appreciate that this office can not go further than it has by the issuance of the regulations and attempt in advance to pass upon the eligibility of specific securities. To do so would be a gigantic task, as it would entail passing upon the entire field of security issues, for not only does it mean passing upon a specific issue for your bank but means passing upon security issues for the entire national banking system and the many security houses and dealers. The most this office can do is to lay down a guiding definition, as has been done, and the board of directors of each bank must, in making investments, apply it. There should be no difficulty in so doing. If there were any doubt as to whether a security falls within the provisions of the act and the regulations, the investment should not be made, for in the last analysis the burden of proof of eligibility rests on the bank. In applying the regulations, your specific attention is called to paragraph 3 on page 2.

Mr. GILBERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. GILBERT. I gather from the gentleman's remarks that the gentleman agrees with me, that the protection of people in their investments by law is an absolute impossibility? Have not all blue sky laws proven ineffective?

Mr. PATMAN. I would not say that, because I am not familiar with all of them.

Mr. GILBERT. After all, the sage was right when he said, "A fool and his money are soon parted." There is no way to prevent that by law.

Mr. PATMAN. If the Members will bear with me a few moments, I want to mention some matters that have come up in the last few days.

There is what is known as the National Economy Committee. This committee presented a petition for redress of grievances to the President and the Congress of the United States a few days ago. In that petition it is stated that 25 per cent of the income of our Nation, or about \$1,000,000,000, is being expended for veterans of wars. They do not say it, but the inference has gone out all over the country that the Congress is authorizing the expenditure of a billion dollars a year for World War veterans. That is being published all over the country. It is not true. Nothing like that is true. The Congress of the United States is not authorizing the expenditure of much more than one-half that much for veterans of the World War. I want to tell you why it is not. It is true that the total appropriation

will aggregate almost \$1,000,000,000 for all wars and for the Military and Naval Establishments, which are peace-time establishments, so far as this appropriation is concerned.

The Regular Establishments spend \$225,000,000 of this every year. The World War veterans get \$117,000,000 a year for military and naval insurance, and it is now being charged up to them. Yes; they get it, but they paid for it themselves. When they went into the Army, they were induced and persuaded to purchase insurance from the United States Government, and practically every one of them had deducted from his pay, from \$6.60 to \$10 a month, out of \$30 a month, in order to pay for the Government life insurance. Now, because they took that insurance and are now collecting from that insurance, they are being charged with raiding the Treasury to the extent of the amount they are receiving by reason of the insurance that they paid for. I do not think that is a fair criticism.

They claim there is \$115,000,000 spent for hospitalization, including salaries and expenses of the officers who have charge of the hospitals, and the doctors and experts, and so forth. That is true, but part of that should be charged up to veterans of other wars, because they use the hospitals, too. Why charge it all up to veterans of the World War?

They charge up \$104,000,000 for disability allowance, and this petition "redress of grievances" has a great deal to say about allowing them this disability allowance, criticising the Government for allowing it to them. Let it be remembered that a large part of the men who are drawing this \$18 a month for a 74 per cent disability are really entitled to a service-connected disability and entitled to \$74 a month; but because their records have been destroyed or lost they are unable to make proof, and they have not had the assistance that others have had, therefore they are required to take \$18 a month instead; and when they take it, they are being criticized by this body, saying it is not right for them to receive that money. Why was that disability allowance law passed? I know why it was passed. We tried to pass a law that would take care of those cases which really had service connection. That was known as the Rankin bill. That covered service-connected cases which really could not make the proof required by law. The bill passed the House and the Senate, and the President vetoed it and his veto was sustained.

Then they introduced what was known as the disability allowance bill. It is nothing more than a pension law. No one denies it is a pension, but who put the pension system upon this country so far as the World War veteran is concerned? The President sent that bill down here, so we were told. We had never seen it. We had never read it. It was never referred to a committee. It was never passed on by a committee. The rules were suspended, and in 40 minutes it passed the House without being subject to amendment. It passed the Senate immediately and became law.

So if the President of the United States is having this body criticized for a pension system, I think it comes with very poor grace from him when we tried to save the country from a pension system by bringing within the terms of the law those cases which really were service connected but which were unable to make proper proof.

That happened on June 26, 1930. The bill came in here like a thunderclap out of a clear sky. No one had seen it nor heard of it. No committee had passed on it. The rules were suspended, and the bill was passed immediately.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has covered the point I intended to ask about. That bill never was referred to the Veterans' Committee nor to any other committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a short question.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. In reference to the bill the gentleman is speaking about, did not that bill come down here after the veto?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; it did after the veto.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Did not that bill go to a committee?

Mr. PATMAN. It did not go to a committee.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. How did it get on the floor of the House?

Mr. PATMAN. It was introduced, given a number, and printed. The Speaker recognized Mr. JOHNSON to bring the bill up under suspension of the rules. If I am not correct, I want to be corrected now.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is correct; I recollect the circumstances now.

Mr. PATMAN. It is said in criticism that the money to be used to pay the veterans their adjusted-service certificates is printing-press money, fiat money, and things like that. That is merely the use of a coined phrase in order to condemn the proposal. Former Senator Owen, who is in New York City at this time, called me over the long-distance telephone this morning and had me take down this message:

The public press criticises your amended bill for paying the adjusted-service certificates in Treasury notes, calling such Treasury notes fiat money and printing-press money.

It is the only way in which you could use the public credit for issuing money because the Federal reserve bank notes and Federal reserve notes both involve the credit of the Federal reserve banks and would be a matter of controversy, but the Treasury notes, backed by the gold standard act of March 14, 1900, have both all the gold available in the Treasury and the credit of the United States behind such notes by a sweeping formal statutory enactment. Your bill goes much farther than that. It provides for the cancellation of said notes if the Federal Reserve Board finds the amount excessive and if the purchasing power of the dollar falls below the average value ascertained by the Department of Labor for the year 1926.

To call said money fiat money is either due to lack of understanding or information or lack of intelligence, unless, perhaps your bill is being deliberately misrepresented.

Senator Owen is one of the best, if not the best informed man on banking and currency in America. He was a co-author of the Federal reserve act and 10 years chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate.

The following article appeared as an editorial in Labor, a national weekly, May 3, 1932:

SANDBAGGING THE BANKS

In an article entitled "Sandbagging the Bankers," printed in the current issue of a popular magazine, PATMAN, of Texas, a young Congressman who has attracted unusual attention during his brief service in the House, frames a serious indictment of the management of our banking system during the last three administrations.

Until the Harding administration, says Mr. PATMAN, banks in places of less than 50,000 inhabitants made nearly all their loans to local borrowers on local security. Then the Comptroller of the Currency "advised" these banks to build up a "secondary reserve" of outside securities. Since the comptroller has the power of life and death over banks they obeyed.

"By the time of the stock-market crash in 1929," says PATMAN, "practically half the money which country banks formerly had loaned in their respective communities had been taken out of the communities and invested in outside securities."

After the crash, Mr. PATMAN reports that the comptroller urged these banks to cut down their local loans, and this is the result:

"Country bankers," he continues, "say that their loss on local loans during the last 10 years has been less than 1 per cent a year, while their losses in securities purchased on recommendation of the Comptroller of the Currency has amounted to 50 per cent, 75 per cent, in some cases almost to 100 per cent."

"This policy has resulted in hundreds of banks closing their doors, while those still open for business are unable to furnish ordinary banking facilities to the residents of their communities."

If Mr. PATMAN is correct, forced purchase of securities by country banks must have contributed materially to the ballooning of prices before the crash. In other words, the change in policy was designed to facilitate the sale of bonds of doubtful value, without regard to the effect on legitimate business and the safety of deposits.

This is a grave charge and, it seems to Labor, is well worthy the attention of a congressional committee.

SALES TAX FALLACY

Prominent officials of the United States are claiming that the Government will almost go into bankruptcy unless Congress passes a sales tax. They expect to displace the income tax, which is the fairest tax on earth, by a sales tax which will place the burdens of the National Government on the poor. Such a tax should never be imposed. The people who would pay it are the ones who are now paying taxes on what

they owe in order to support the cities, counties, road districts, school districts, and States.

THE WEALTH OF THE NATION

Let us see how near bankruptcy our Nation is. The wealth of the Nation is \$400,000,000,000. The Government owes \$17,500,000,000, and from this should be subtracted \$12,500,000,000 owed to the Government by the railroads, banks, and foreign countries, which is evidenced by their signed obligations. Without considering what is owed to the Government, our national debt is only $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the national wealth. After the Civil War, our country owed 10 per cent of the national wealth. At this time France owes 20 per cent of her national wealth, England 40 per cent of hers, and Germans much more than that. This information is not offered as a justification for extravagance, but is given to refute the argument that the country will be bankrupt if the sales tax is defeated. The increased taxes from incomes in one year of prosperity will pay the deficit of many years. The Government should be economically administered. Money should not be taken from the people in the form of taxes to be wasted or used for unnecessary enterprises.

CONGRESS SHOULD REGULATE THE VALUE OF MONEY

The Constitution of the United States says that Congress shall coin money and regulate its value. Because a few of us are asking that this constitutional mandate be assumed by Congress for the purpose of breaking this panic, it is claimed that we are asking for the kind of inflation the people of Germany and Russia experienced a few years ago. A few international bankers have been issuing the money and regulating its value by contraction and expansion of the currency; this power should be taken away from them; present conditions present the best argument in favor of such a proposal. The people are studying the money problem as they have never studied it before. They are going to get the facts. When they do, their representatives in Congress will be required to carry out their will. Then there will be some changes made for the benefit of the people. Mr. Dawes said, "It is dangerous to tinker with the currency system." It has not only been dangerous but destructive to the people for Mr. Dawes and a few other international bankers to tinker with it for their own benefit as they have done.

IDLE GOLD SHOULD BE USED

Two and one-half billion dollars of new money can be issued by our Government on the idle gold that is in the Treasury. If it can be distributed over the Nation in payment of services or obligations, it will be placed in the banks. Every dollar of new money will be a basis for \$10 of credit. How much is \$2,000,000,000? One-half of 1 per cent of our national wealth; one-fourth of the amount given to Europe by the United States; less than one-third of the wealth of Andrew Mellon and his brother.

WHAT GOVERNMENT IS SPENDING FOR VETERANS

The Government is now spending 25 per cent of its income on veteran relief. Only about $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent for relief of World War Veterans. What of it? Relief for veterans of wars is purely a matter for National Government. Local governments spend nothing for such relief. It is not their duty. You can pick up the tax receipt of most any citizen and say, "Why you are spending 50 per cent of your tax money for roads, or 50 per cent for schools, or 25 per cent to support the government of a certain city." There is no news to that. But if the Government was spending 50 per cent of its income for building highways and the local district was spending 50 per cent of its income for veterans, there would be room for talk.

PENSIONS AFTER CIVIL WAR

Fourteen years after the Civil War the Government was spending more for veterans' relief than is being spent now for the relief of the World War veterans, considering the wealth of the Nation then and now—the ability of the Nation to pay. If we presume that the Southern States were spending as much for veteran relief by reason of the Civil

War as the National Government was spending on the Union soldiers, there was twice as much money spent for veteran relief 14 years after the Civil War as is being spent now. In addition, a dollar then would buy more than it will to-day.

DEFLATION DESTRUCTIVE

Deflation is destroying our country. Our greatest and best-informed citizens declare that it was unnecessary and deliberately caused. I wonder if it was brought on to force people to pay three and four dollars in commodities for every dollar of bonds they voted on themselves to make public improvements. The bonds are held by the deflationists; interest on the bonds is increased in proportion. This situation can be cured. Congress must cure it or take the blame. The people can not pay inflated debts with deflated incomes caused by low-priced commodities and small salaries.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, during my absence from the floor I understand my distinguished colleague from Texas launched another attack on the generals and on the Army and Navy Club.

Mr. BLANTON. But I notified the gentleman an hour before I spoke that I was going to discuss those matters and asked him to be present.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I do not think my distinguished colleague and his friend from Tennessee should take their defeat so seriously in a fair up and down fight. The question was before one of the standing committees of this House and before the Committee of the Whole of this House, and eventually on a vote of this House they were cleaned up in a fair and square fight. Why can they not take their defeat gracefully and stop whining about it? The truth of the matter is I am tired of this misrepresentation about the saving of \$100,000,000. I saw in a St. Louis newspaper, coming from the district of my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], that he held me responsible for tacking onto this country \$100,000,000 of expense through the defeat of the Army and Navy consolidation.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I yield. The gentleman gave an interview to one of the local correspondents of that paper.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I generally read the papers from my own city, but I saw no story charging the gentleman with being responsible. The gentleman, of course, assisted to defeat the bill. I charged the President of the United States with being responsible for defeating the bill by informing the country and the House of Representatives, not in a direct message but otherwise, that he opposed the consolidation of the Army and Navy.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. Then the gentleman has been misquoted. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. If that statement was included in the story, I failed to see it. The gentleman, of course, would not deny his opposition to the bill. What it would have saved is debatable, but I feel it would save fifty to one hundred million if properly administered.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. The gentleman has been misquoted. As a matter of fact, as I stated on this floor, that proposition was nothing short of humbuggery. It would not have saved one dollar or one dime of additional expense.

Rather it would have been an extravagance. It would have added to the public expense. That was demonstrated through a long committee hearing, through long sessions, through testimony, and truth is truth and must prevail. But my friend, to further his cause, brings in that poor old moth-eaten Army and Navy Club. He tries to make it appear that social influences and these gilded generals are responsible for his defeat, that they have unusual influence in this House. I want to assure my friend from Texas, the great champion of the poor and downtrodden, that he would be a wealthy man in the Army and Navy Club, among those poor Army and Navy officers, and if he would but inform himself on that club, just as he has not informed himself on the Army and Navy consolidation tax measure, he would probably quit this harping on the Army and Navy Club and also on this consolidation.

As a matter of fact, a very distinguished Member of this body, a former outstanding chairman of the Appropriations Committee, John Fitzgerald, of Brooklyn, than whom no more distinguished man has ever ornamented this House, was invited to join this Army and Navy Club. He said, "No; I do not want to join that club, because those fellows will be logrolling all the time; they will bother the life out of me for appropriations and promotions. No; I do not want to join that club." But at last his friends prevailed on him and he did join. After being a member for years and after enjoying his associations at the club, he said, "The only objection I have to it is that when I go in there they do not even speak to me. I have been subjected to no pressure or logrolling." What better testimony could you have than that?

Mr. BLANTON. He was not in their class. They were exercising their seniority. He was beneath their notice.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. The gentleman thinks, then, they would logroll with him but not with Mr. Fitzgerald?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman would find that they would treat him the very same way they treated Mr. Fitzgerald. They would absolutely ignore him.

Mr. BLANTON. Only generals and admirals would be recognized?

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I do not know but that would be a sensible thing to do with the gentleman from Texas. Some of them are very wise men. The difference, if you will pardon this personal allusion, between the gentleman from Texas and myself is that he is a politician and I am a statesman. [Applause.] The difference between a politician and a statesman is this, that you are looking out for the fall elections, while I am looking out for succeeding generations.

Mr. BLANTON. I never did that in my life. I never looked out for elections. The people take care of me.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. I come from a district which is overwhelmingly Republican, and as a Democrat I had to fight for my election, not in a primary election but in a general election. We have two parties in Oregon.

Mr. BLANTON. My district went for Hoover 11,000 votes in 1928, and went for me 48,000. My constituents exercise their own judgment—

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. And yet the gentleman prides himself on his Democracy. [Applause.] What kind of Democrats have you in your district?

Mr. BLANTON. And sometimes send Republicans here and sometimes Democrats.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. We send Democrats when they are the right kind of Democrats. Going to the subject of statesmanship, I am going to dwell just a few minutes on a great question that is coming before this House to-morrow, a statesmanship problem, not a political problem, not a fall-election problem, but a problem for all time for this country, and that is the question of the preservation of the national defense. I am not going into all the details of that because I have not the time. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Oregon. After the Civil War the armies that had been organized during that conflict were disbanded and the Regular Army was reduced to a mere handful compared with the size of this great Nation. It was stationed very largely in the western part of the country and was engaged in protection of the rapidly moving frontier in its progress across the continent. At the outbreak of the Spanish War it consisted of 2,179 officers and 25,353 enlisted men. (Annual Report of Secretary of War, June 30, 1897.)

The operations of the Spanish War brought vividly to light the weakness of the Army and its total lack of a modern staff. The success that we attained was against an even more poorly prepared nation, and a serious catastrophe might have been our lot had our opponent been even moderately prepared for the conflict.

The one improvement that resulted from the Spanish War was the creation and organization of a general staff. Even though this staff was not sufficient in numbers to perform the duties that its name presupposed, it did provide a body of selected officers whose duty it was to think about problems of national defense and to make plans therefor.

The Army was enlarged during the 15 years that followed the Spanish War, and the outbreak of the World War in 1914 found this Nation with 4,701 officers and 87,781 enlisted men (exclusive of the Philippine Scouts). (Annual Report of Secretary of War, June 30, 1914.)

Almost from the outbreak of the World War situations arose in which the interests of this country were involved and which led thinking people to fear that howsoever much we might desire to remain neutral we were in danger of being dragged into the world conflict. Among the leading statesmen who gave their attention to this problem were the Hon. George E. Chamberlain, Senator from Oregon, who was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, and the Hon. James Hay, chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, both of them of the Democratic Party.

Various proposals were suggested during the last half of 1914 and the first half of 1915 and many plans were submitted for consideration. None of these met with popular approval nor with the approval of the Committees on Military Affairs, either of the House or of the Senate. In the late summer of 1915 these two committees decided to make use of the voluminous hearings that had been held on this subject and to draft legislation, which, in their opinion, would more nearly meet the needs and desires of the Nation than any of the other plans that had been proposed.

These committees brought to this work a thorough knowledge of the Military Establishment, a knowledge of the national temperament, and vivid memories of the Spanish War which fitted them preeminently to deal with the subject. In addition to that they were singularly free from preconceived ideas and were determined to produce a new plan of national defense which would be a consistent whole and be free from the weaknesses and objections arising out of piecemeal legislation which had characterized the acts effecting the Military Establishment for the preceding 50 years. They determined to treat the Army as a whole; to study the fundamental needs of the Nation, and to reorganize each and every part of the Military Establishment, having in mind the duties and responsibilities of each component as a part of a new machine.

I am entirely safe in asserting that no such approach to our military problem had ever been made within the memory of man then living. Every arm and service of the military establishment was studied separately regarding the duties with which it was charged under the laws and regulations, and each and every one was then studied with regard to its part in the machine as a whole. The armies of foreign nations were likewise examined as to the proportions existing amongst the various arms and as to the organization and functions of each part.

The committees of the House and Senate worked long and patiently on the draft of this bill, later known as the national defense act of (June 3) 1916, and finally produced in a conference between the two committees the first comprehensive bill dealing with that subject that we have ever had on our statute books.

For many reasons, well known to each of you, amongst which are the temper of this Nation toward a large standing army, the difficulties of adjusting conflicting ideas in regard to military matters, and the necessity of reasonable economy even in such vital matters as national defense, the national defense act of 1916 did not satisfy the desires of the more militant of our population and exceeded those of more pacifistic tendencies. However, it struck a happy medium between the two extremes and it did set up a well-balanced land force such as we had never had before, providing for an army of 11,263 officers and 217,750 enlisted men, exclusive of the Philippine Scouts.

The act which finally passed the House and Senate was approved by President Wilson on June 3, 1916. The provisions were to be put into effect over a period of five years. Before the end of the first year, however, we found ourselves at war with Germany and her allies. Very fortunately for this country this act provided for a very material expansion of the Regular Army, on a sound basis, and hasty, ill-considered legislation for the land forces immediately upon the outbreak of war was unnecessary.

Our experience during the World War naturally taught us many lessons that were not known when this act was passed. In that we were no different from all the other nations that participated in the World War, and following the end of that war the national defense act was amended in many particulars by the act of June 4, 1920.

A new system was devised, essentially American, and written into the national defense act. It represents one of the greatest and most constructive developments evolved by the American Government in recent years. By a combination of a small professional force to act as a training cadre and nucleus, and the utilization of various types and classes of citizens trained in the military art, there has resulted for the first time in the history of this country a more or less adequate preparation for any eventuality, and at a cost within reasonable figures. Different types of citizen soldiers have been provided for so that inducement is offered for practically every group within the country. These consist of the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, the citizens' military training camps, the National Rifle Association, and various classifications of military schools and colleges. The Regular Army, of course, is the bulwark and basis of the structure. The national defense act provided that it should consist of 18,000 officers and 285,000 men. This strength has been progressively decreased in the past decade and now has reached a figure of approximately 12,000 officers and 125,000 men. This is below the point of safety.

Other amendments have been made to the basic act of June 3, 1916, but none of them, including the amendment of 1920, has changed its fundamental provisions. All of these amendments together are not to be considered in importance when compared with the fundamental changes that the original defense act of 1916 made in the provisions of the law that existed previous to its passage.

I have briefly rehearsed these facts in order to demonstrate that all the fundamental provisions of existing law in regard to our land forces were produced from the minds of great men in our own party and that the fundamental provisions of existing law are the results of neither haphazard nor hastily considered legislation. They are the products not only of mature thinking in regard to our national needs but also of long experience in legislative matters affecting the Army, and any changes therein ought to be made only after the same processes and in the light of further experience.

Without any desire to cast aspersions upon my colleagues, I feel prepared to say that the statesmen who considered and developed the national defense act were the equal of those of us who are handling this problem to-day. I am more than equally prepared to say that the knowledge that we have gained during the 16 years since that act was passed leads to the belief that we are in need of more rather than less strength in our land forces, and only a due regard for economy in these trying times deters me from so proposing.

Our interests that must be defended grow as time passes, and just as one increases his fire insurance with the increase in the value of his home, so the strength of the forces charged with our national defense should logically be expected to increase with the population and growth of our country.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, this morning's papers carry the story of a so-called "nonpartisan," political conference held at the White House Sunday night. Instead of the President holding his weekly political confer-

ence at Rapidan yesterday and fishing for trout and goggle-eyed perch in the mountain streams, our Chief Executive is evidently continuing to fish for ways and means to lay the blame for the stupidity and waste of the first three years and more of the Hoover administration on the backs of this House merely because the Democrats have a bare five or six majority.

If press reports are true, the President's usual Sunday political conference was behind closed doors, and only the high moguls of the Republican Party were invited. It is stated that the conference lasted far into the night, and it was finally decided to call it a "nonpartisan" conference and that it was decided that Congress should again be asked to pass the President's so-called nonpartisan program of alleged economy. No Democrats attended or were invited.

The Washington Post, that is probably the most rock-ribbed, uncompromising Republican newspaper in America and that usually expresses supreme satisfaction at any move of the President, is evidently becoming disgusted, judging from an editorial appearing in to-day's Post that is a severe but just indictment of the tactics of the President, and especially with reference to Sunday's White House conference.

Ever since the inauguration of the present occupant of the White House the country has been "propaganded" with the slogan, "Stand by the President." This has been the watchword of extreme partisan newspapers and many Republican politicians.

Occasionally I have received letters from Republican friends in Oklahoma that usually began and ended with that time-worn slogan, and it matters little whether it be a high tariff bill, a moratorium on foreign war debts, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other of the many measures by and for the international bankers. Because it happens to be a pet measure of the President there are a few good citizens of my State who are so blindly partisan that they write or wire me to by all means "stand by the President."

The fact that Congress has too long stood by the President in his rampage of extravagance, waste, and stupidity is largely responsible for the depleted condition of the Federal Treasury and for the necessity of balancing the Budget. At the beginning of the Hoover administration Congress was called upon to give the President a Federal farm board, and many Democrats joined Republicans in giving the President an opportunity to help stabilize prices of farm commodities. This has been jokingly called the first of the President's many "noble experiments." Anyway, it was only the first of many mighty expensive experiments. Farm prices have gradually declined from almost the very hour the President's Farm Board was appointed. Cotton has gone down from 10 to 12 cents a pound to 4 and 5 cents, and wheat has tumbled from \$1.18 to 30 cents per bushel.

The next White House experiment was the Hawley-Smoot-Grundy tariff bill. Many Democrats who had reluctantly yielded to the plea to give the President a free hand in appointing a farm board could not in good conscience hold their noses and vote for the administration's tariff bill. During those long weeks that the tariff bill was pending some of my best friends in Oklahoma wrote and wired me to "discard politics and stand by the President." In the face of the fact that administration leaders gave many assurances to Congress and the country that this Republican high-tariff measure would restore prosperity within 60 days after its passage, I not only refused to vote for it but spoke against it on the floor of this House, and used every honorable means to bring about its defeat. Congress then, with an overwhelming Republican majority, did the bidding of the White House and passed the most outrageous, unscientific, unfair, and unreasonable high tariff bill ever enacted in the history of any Congress. More than 30 nations of the world have retaliated against America by raising their tariff walls, and to-day the American farmer has no market for his products in any country on the face of the earth.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all of the expensive experiments in which the Hoover administration has indulged.

When this Congress convened last December, after the Chief Executive had taken it upon himself to promise the international bankers, and incidentally certain European nations, that the United States would grant a moratorium to some of the foreign governments, I was besieged with letters and telegrams from many Republicans and a few misguided Democrats to stand by the President. We were assured that at last our internationally minded President had made his master stroke; a master political stroke to be sure, but one that would without doubt revive business and hasten the end of the depression. It would be political suicide and decidedly unpatriotic to oppose the President's moratorium, so we were warned. But I not only voted against the moratorium but made a speech on the floor of the House against it. Had the White House demanded that the international bankers also declare a moratorium on their private loans to Europe, there might have been some justification for his course [applause], but no such demands were made. The gold that had been shipped to America by Europe and that would have aided much to replenish a depleted Treasury, never left Wall Street. It was not shipped back to Europe but remained in the vaults of the international bankers.

When it began to percolate through to the country that the President's moratorium was really a dole to the international bankers and that Congress and the country had been tricked and deceived, another series of experiments was begun, the first of which was the so-called Reconstruction Finance Corporation. What a high-sounding name they gave this—another Wall Street baby! [Applause.] The administration propaganda went forth and again we were admonished to stand by the President. We were assured this would ease up money matters and quickly cure the depression. I could not vote for that bill but many Democrats of this House did so, hoping it would prove to be all they felt in their hearts it was not.

Then, when the country found that the \$2,000,000,000 Finance Corporation was really a dole for big business and not relief for the little man, another "experiment" was essential. We were then handed a Federal land-bank measure, but when passed it proved to be a bondholders' bill. I had introduced a measure proposing a 2-year moratorium on Federal land-bank loans and reluctantly supported the President's land bank bill, but when I asked the Federal land bank to ease up on foreclosures against the farmers of my district and reminded them of the passage of the Federal land bank act I was given to understand in a polite way that instead of being a farm relief bill it was primarily for the relief of the bondholders of the Federal land bank.

After the present Congress had passed several pet measures of the White House that turned out to be doles to big business, by and for Wall Street and other special interests, we first heard the Executive plea for economy. The President wanted Congress to turn the reorganization of the various departments over to him alone; but remembering his unprecedented record for creating new high-salaried commissions that seldom meet or report to Congress, this body did not choose to do so. A House Economy Committee appointed by the Speaker, after many weeks of investigations and study, brought in a comprehensive, intelligent, and progressive program as a whole, the more important provisions of which were eliminated by administration leaders on this floor who always follow the President.

This week I received a letter from a prominent business man of Oklahoma, in which he severely criticized Congress for its dilatory tactics, its failure to materially reduce expenses of the Federal Government, for its failure to combine the Army and Navy under one head and thus save seventy-five to one hundred million dollars a year; and then to my surprise he closed by urging me to stand by the President. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that Congress has been dilatory in cutting expenses of government, and has failed in many ways to live up to the expectations of the country, but just how anyone could seriously talk of economy and at the same time advocate that Congress stand by the President is beyond my imagination. It is conceded that the

President and his Cabinet officers, who are supposed to speak for him, and the high-powered Army and naval officers are directly responsible for the failure of many provisions of the House economy bill, including the one proposing to combine the Army and Navy under one Bureau of National Defense. The fact that one of the President's several \$10,000 secretaries, whom the Government furnishes a big Lincoln car and a chauffeur, came on the floor of Congress and buttonholed Members of the House and lobbied against many provisions of the economy bill, including the Army and Navy proposal, is significant.

The recent outburst against Congress by the Chief Executive and his appeal to the country to "help him make Congress economize" is the latest "master" political stroke. It is like a drowning man grasping for a straw. Personally, I voted for every provision in the House economy bill proposing to reduce expenditures of government except one that was manifestly unfair to disabled war veterans. I not only have voted to reduce my own salary and office expense, including my stationery allowance, which in fact is now far below what it costs any Congressman who actually answers all of his mail, but I supported the proposal to combine the Army and Navy under one head, and thus save an additional hundred million dollars. As I said before, that and many other provisions were eliminated because of the active opposition of the White House.

If the Chief Executive had loved the dear people in November as he professes to in May, his plea to the country to "help him make Congress economize" might come with better grace. Congress provides the President with an army of experts to figure out and advise the lowest possible dollar on which the respective departments and bureaus of government could function. That estimate was submitted at the beginning of the present session and Congress has cut the President's Budget estimate 10 per cent or more for every department and bureau, and in each instance such cuts were made over the vehement protest of the heads of such departments. All told, Congress has reduced the Budget estimate of the President more than \$168,000,000 below White House estimates. [Applause.]

The most absurd and unreasonable political propaganda is that calling on Members of Congress to stand by the President and his multimillionaire Secretary of the Treasury in matters of taxation. This House passed a revenue bill that raised the income tax materially in the higher brackets. At the time the revenue bill was pending, in a speech on this floor I said among other things:

But, answering the question, "What would I do about it?" Aside from increasing the surtax, corporation tax, and income tax, I would reenact the excess-profits tax that brought in over \$300,000,000 in 1921, but that is left out of this bill. Then I would cut expenses of this Government to the bone before calling on the people for additional taxes. I would abolish countless commissions and overlapping and useless boards and bureaus. You can not cut too much for me.

Not only did I advocate increasing the income tax in the higher brackets, but I was persistent in advocating a real tax of not less than 1 per cent on all sales of stock exchanges. That would have brought to the Treasury \$300,000,000 to \$400,000,000 each year. In my speech on the floor of this House on this subject last March I said, in part:

These Wall Street gamblers do not confine themselves to intangible stocks, mythical securities, and bogus memorandums, but they gamble to the tune of billions of dollars on commodities they never see but which are produced by the sweat of the brows of millions of honest, hard-working farmers of America. Instead of prices of farm commodities being based on the law of supply and demand, they are too often controlled by and held at the mercy of Wall Street stock gamblers. [Applause.]

After the House had placed an insignificant tax of one-fourth of 1 per cent on the stock exchanges the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before a Senate committee and induced the Senate to adopt the Hoover-Mills plan reducing the taxation in the higher brackets, eliminating all the tax on stock exchanges, and letting the burden of governmental expense fall more heavily on the shoulders of the poor. That is the "constructive" tax plan Democrats are

called on to support; that demonstrates the type of leadership we are asked to follow; that is the so-called nonpartisan program we are urged and implored to embrace.

In conclusion let me say that I do not pretend to speak for others, but as for myself I can not in good conscience turn my back on every fundamental principle of government I have held for a lifetime and support such a program, even though it may be that of the President of the United States. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.

DEFINITIONS AND EXCEPTIONS

SECTION 1. (a) When used in this act the following terms shall, unless the text otherwise indicates, have the following respective meanings:

(1) "Security" shall include any stock, note, bond, debenture, evidence of indebtedness, certificate of interest or participation, interim certificate or receipt, or any other instrument commonly known as a security, but shall not include any policy or contract of insurance issued by any insurance company authorized to transact business in the District of Columbia by the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia.

(2) "Person" shall include a natural person, a partnership, a joint-stock company, a corporation, a trust, and any unincorporated association.

(3) "Dealer" shall include every person other than a salesman who in the District of Columbia engages either for all or part of his time directly or through an agent in the business of selling any securities, including securities issued by such person; or who in said District engages in offering, buying, selling, or otherwise dealing or trading in securities as agent or principal for a commission or at a profit. "Registered dealer" shall mean a dealer registered under the provisions of this act. The business of trading or dealing in securities within the meaning of this section shall not include an isolated transaction in which a specific security is sold or offered for sale by an owner who is not the issuer or underwriter thereof and who sells the same for his own account.

(4) "Salesman" shall include every person employed or appointed or authorized by a dealer to sell or to offer for sale within the District of Columbia, for a commission or compensation, any security to any person. The partners of a partnership and the executive officers of a corporation or other association registered as a dealer shall not be salesmen within the meaning of this definition, nor shall such clerical or other employees of a registered dealer as are employed for work to which the sale of securities is secondary and incidental. "Registered salesman" shall mean a salesman registered under the provisions of this act.

(b) The term "include," when used in a definition contained in this act, shall not be deemed to exclude other things or persons otherwise within the meaning of the term defined. In the interpretation of this act, words importing the masculine gender shall be held to include all genders, except where such construction would be unreasonable.

(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to any receiver, referee, administrator, executor, guardian, or other person appointed or acting under the judgment or order of any court, nor to any public officer while performing his official duty, nor to any national bank or trust company organized under an act of the Congress and transacting business as a bank or trust company within the District of Columbia.

(d) The provisions of this act shall not apply to any sale or offer for sale of securities to any bank, banker, savings bank, trust company, building and loan association, insurance company, or other financial institution, or to any corporation, or to a registered dealer, or to any person engaged in the business of acquiring securities for the purpose of resale to the public; nor to any sale or offer for sale of securities to any syndicate or group formed for the specific purpose of acquiring such securities for resale to the public directly or through other syndicates or groups; nor to any sale or offer for sale of securities upon the floor of any exchange to a dealer in securities; nor to the sale of space for advertising of securities in any newspaper, magazine, or publication; nor to the offering of securities by any person in conjunction with a registered dealer by use of advertisement, circular, or pamphlet, provided such person does not otherwise attempt to sell such securities in the District of Columbia, and that the name of such registered dealer appears in such advertisement, circular, or pamphlet.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, evidently we can not finish this bill to-night. It is nearly 5 o'clock, and I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee having had under consideration

the bill (H. R. 9064) to supervise and regulate the sale of securities within the District of Columbia, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BULWINKLE, on account of important business.

THE DEPRESSION

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by ex-Senator Robert L. Owen, on the subject of the depression.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to me by ex-Senator Robert L. Owen:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 4, 1932.

HON. HENRY T. RAINEY,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

ARE THE DEMOCRATS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEPRESSION?

MY DEAR MR. RAINEY: On April 14, 1932, on the first page of a bulletin called "The Republican" published weekly by the Republican National Committee, Charles F. Scott, editor, in the Barr Building, Washington D. C., appeared the charge that the Democratic Party was responsible for the beginning of deflation and that they began it in 1920 and before the Republican Party came into power.

This astounding charge is made in the article referred to which is as follows:

"WHEN DEFLATION BEGAN"

"It is an illustration of the brevity of human memory that already the question is being asked, 'When did deflation begin, and who was responsible for it?' And since this question is being asked, it ought to be answered even at the cost of threshing over old straw.

"The first mention of deflation following the war is found in a message which President Wilson sent to Congress on August 8, 1919, when he said:

"Wheat shipments and credits to facilitate the purchase of our wheat can and will be limited and controlled in such a way as not to raise but rather to lower the price of flour."

"In December the Federal Reserve Board, all Democrats, put into effect an increase in rates on advances and rediscounts, the immediate result of which was to deflate the currency. On January 10, 1920, the Federal Reserve Board, still all Democrats, notified all member banks that loans from central institutions must be reduced. More deflation. January 23, 1920, the Federal reserve bank again raised their rediscount rate, this time to 6 per cent, the purpose and result being to call loans all over the country.

"Senator Owen, a Democrat, charged that this policy caused a depression of Liberty bonds from 8 to 15 per cent, and a loss to Liberty-bond holders at \$3,000,000,000.

"In May, 1920, the Federal Reserve Board, still all Democrats, took further steps toward deflation, and Representative GARNER, Democrat, now Speaker, wrote a formal protest to the board, stating that its deflation policy was proving 'ruinous to the cattle industry in the South and Southwest.'

"Referring to this same period and to the same deflation policy, John Skelton Williams, Comptroller of the Currency during the Wilson administration, and as such a member ex officio of the Federal Reserve Board, on October 19, 1922, in a letter to the New York Times, said:

"During the most drastic months of deflation, while the system was reducing credit about \$100,000,000, the only members of the board who resisted and opposed the board's drastic deflation policy and their radical enforcement were myself and Hon. Henry A. Moehlenpach, of Wisconsin."

"William G. McAdoo, Democrat, in a signed article in the Manufacturers Record, December 23, 1920, said:

"The farmers are suffering colossal losses as a result of the drastic deflation which has been put into effect by the Federal Reserve Board."

"He was referring to the same measures of deflation carried out by the all-Democratic Federal Reserve Board under the Wilson administration.

"The final and conclusive proof as to the time when the deflation of farm prices took place is shown in the market reports themselves. July, 1920, corn was \$1.53; September, \$1.29; October, 87 cents; and by the following April, 55 cents. Cattle in November, 1920, were \$14.57; went to \$9.84 in January, and down to \$8.09 in June. Wheat, \$2.80 in July, \$2.01 in December, and \$1.43 in the following June. Hogs were \$15.88 in July, \$9.66 in December. Wool was 90 cents in July and 54 cents in December. Cotton was 39 cents in July and 14 cents in December. All these are Chicago prices.

"Remembering that the Republican administration did not take over the country until March 4, 1921, it will be seen that the drastic deflation which Mr. McAdoo declared was inflicting 'colossal losses upon the farmers,' and which Speaker GARNER pro-

tested against on the score that it was proving 'ruinous to the cattle industry in the South and Southwest,' was inaugurated and carried into effect under the Democratic administration."

Obviously, the author of this article, whoever he may be, had given considerable study to the question in order to dig up quotations from the Hon. William G. McAdoo, the Hon. John N. Garner, Hon. John Skelton Williams, and myself. Why should Mr. McAdoo, Mr. Garner, Mr. Williams, and myself be denouncing what the Republican National Committee sets forth as a Democratic policy?

The three members who favored contraction—Harding, Warburg, and Miller—favored a Republican policy and could not be called Democratic. Hamlin and Moehlenpah did not favor it and Williams opposed it.

The charge made by the Republican is either a case of unpardonable ignorance or of shameless political mendacity.

It should be obvious that at the close of the World War, when credit and currency were necessarily expanded to meet the exigencies of national defense, it was done by the Democratic Party as unavoidably necessary to finance the World War, and since the expansion was justified, it could not be called an inflation of credit and currency because it was, in fact, a justified expansion, while inflation means an unjustified expansion.

The political responsibility for contracting credit and currency rests upon the shoulders of the Republican Party, evidence of which will be found in the official records of the United States, and of the Republican Party itself.

In May, 1920, the Hon. Medill McCormick, Republican United States Senator from Illinois, introduced Senate Resolution 363, as follows:

"Resolved, That the Federal Reserve Board be directed to advise the Senate what steps it purposes to take or to recommend to the member banks of the Federal reserve system to meet the existing inflation of currency and credits and consequent high prices, and what further steps it purposes to take or recommend to mobilize credits in order to move the 1920 crop."

He urged this upon the Senate on May 17, 1920, and it passed the Senate unnoticed. He defended it on the floor of the Senate by saying in plain words that the resolution simply asked for information and that "It asks for nothing more." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7145).

He defended it as a means of mobilizing credit for the benefit of the farmers of the country and he said in defending it "unless steps are taken to-day to mobilize the necessary credit resources, the farmers will be hard put to it to find money this fall when it is necessary for their very living." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7145).

The resolution was adopted without objection and without being understood or attracting any serious notice.

As a matter of fact this resolution was prepared for the Senator from Illinois and was passed for the purpose of influencing the Federal Reserve Board and to support the Federal reserve advisory council which met on May 18, 1920, and of which Mr. James B. Forgan, of Illinois, was the president. They had a Federal Reserve Board conference on the 18th day of May, 1920, in which the members of the Federal Reserve Board, 12 members of the Federal reserve advisory council and 36 Class A directors of the Federal reserve banks, met in a secret meeting and determined by majority vote upon a policy of contracting credit and currency, a full account of which will be found in Senate Document No. 310, 67th Congress, 4th Session, ordered to be printed by the Senate on February 24, 1923.

It is perfectly obvious from this record that this action was taken at the instance of and in behalf of powerful financial interests which controlled the great banks of the country and controlled the Federal reserve banks.

Since it may be conceded that these forces are and have been for many years the financial supporters and campaign contributors of the Republican Party, the origin of this deflation policy is perfectly obvious.

At that time I was chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate, and I resented the passage of this resolution in my absence from the Senate and the passing of the resolution without reference to the Banking and Currency Committee; and on the following day, May 18, 1920, as the representative of the Democratic administration, I protested against the passage of this unwise and misleading resolution. I vigorously protested against it and said:

"I am personally friendly with every man on the Reserve Board. . . . But I differ with them in policy. I disagree with their policy. I disagree with the advice they are getting. I do not know who is giving the advice, but, whoever it is, I do not agree with the advice. I do not agree with the policy, and I am protesting against this because I believe it is going to lead to an industrial depression. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLean] smiles at these suggestions and must either think it an improbability, or perhaps he welcomes it."

"Mr. McLean, No, Mr. President; I have not much use for prophets of evil and hope the industrial depression will not come. I do not think there is any need for it."

"Mr. OWEN. It will not come with my consent."

It did come with terrifying results, over 6,000 banks failing as one of the results.

The report of the Federal Reserve Board on Senate Resolution 363 appears as Senate Document No. 280, Sixty-sixth Congress, second session, and did not advocate any drastic steps toward deflation, but said in words: "Too rapid deflation will be injurious and should be avoided." That was the language of the Federal Reserve Board.

But the responsibility of the deflation was clearly upon the Federal reserve banks, but they would have assumed no such responsibility except for the formal backing and demand of the Republican Party of the United States.

The responsibility for the depression of 1920-21, due to the contraction of credit and currency at that time, was assumed by the Republican Party in the Republican platform adopted at the Seventeenth National Republican Convention on the 10th day of June, 1920, at Chicago, in which they said:

"We pledge ourselves to earnest and consistent attack upon the high cost of living, by vigorous avoidance of further inflation in our Government borrowing, by courageous and intelligent deflation of overexpanded credit and currency, etc." (P. 103, Official Proceedings of the Seventeenth Republican National Convention.)

Senator Warren G. Harding, the nominee of the Republican Party, was presented with the notice of nomination by Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, who said, among other things: "Here to-day you . . . will declare your purposes and those of the party you lead" (p. 254), and Senator Harding, Republican candidate for the presidency, said: "Gross expansion of currency and credit has depreciated the dollar just as expansion and inflation have discredited the coin of the world. We inflated in haste; we must deflate in deliberation. . . . We will attempt intelligent and courageous deflation," etc. (p. 266).

Under the sponsorship of the Republican Party, the deflation immediately proceeded with the terrible results described in the bulletin now set forth by the Republican National Committee, in which they point out corn fell from \$1.53 per bushel to 55 cents per bushel; cattle from \$14.57 to \$8.09; wheat from \$2.80 to \$1.43; hogs from \$15.88 to \$9.66; wool from 90 to 54 cents; and cotton from 39 to 14 cents—Chicago prices. The dollar worshiped by the patrons of the Republican Party doubled in purchasing power and millions of men were ruined.

The official records of the Agricultural Department show that the property of the farmers and stock men was appraised at \$79,000,000,000 in 1920 and immediately fell to \$58,500,000,000, a net loss of \$20,500,000,000 to the farmers and stockmen of the country from which they have never recovered, and the last depression is even far worse than the first.

It is no wonder that the Republican National Committee should now attempt to fasten upon the Democratic Party the responsibility of the deflation of 1920-21, but the attitude of the Democratic Party upon this question is not left to conjecture. It is written in their platform of 1924, a plank which I had the honor to draft, as follows, to wit:

"REPUBLICAN CONTRACTION OF CREDIT AND CURRENCY"

"We denounce the recent cruel and unjust contraction of legitimate and necessary credit and currency, which was directly due to the so-called deflation policy of the Republican Party as declared in its national platform of June, 1920, and in the speech of acceptance of its candidate for the Presidency. Within 18 months after the election of 1920 this policy resulted in withdrawing bank loans and discounts by over \$5,000,000,000 and in contracting our currency by over \$1,500,000,000. This contraction bankrupted hundreds of thousands of farmers and stock growers in America and resulted in widespread industrial depression and unemployment. We demand that the Federal reserve system be so administered as to give stability to industry, commerce, and finance, as was intended by the Democratic Party, which gave the Federal reserve system to the Nation."

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY FOR THE PANIC OF 1920-21 AND THE DEPRESSION OF 1929 TO 1932

There can be no possible doubt about the responsibility of the Republican Party for the depression of 1920-21 which bankrupted agriculture and its allied industries in the United States, or about their responsibility for the severity of the depression of 1929 to 1932, inclusive.

As they controlled the Presidency, the Senate, and the House of Representatives, the Republican administration was responsible for the conduct of the Federal Reserve Board and of the Federal reserve banks from 1920 to 1932. The expansion of credit and bank loans during 1927, 1928, and 1929 for speculation in the stock market and in other ways created a dangerous condition which should have been corrected by the power of the Federal reserve system operating through individual member banks and preventing their lending money for known speculative purposes, either on the stock exchange, in real estate, or in the commodity markets.

Instead of pursuing this sound policy and continuing to supply the productive forces of the Nation with abundant credit at reasonable rates, the reserve banks and the Reserve Board, under the management of the Republican administration, pursued a systematic course of contracting credit and currency from 1928 to February, 1932, inclusive, penalizing legitimate business, impairing their earning power, discouraging their efforts, and laying the foundation for a major bear movement which ensued in October, 1929.

On May 27, 1929, being most anxious to protect the country from the severity of a reaction which was at that time threatening and could have been modified. I called the attention of the administration to 10 different ways in which the Reserve Board and the reserve banks were contracting credit and currency and penalizing legitimate business and urged the administration to take steps to safeguard the country against the threatened collapse which ensued five months later. When they started to raise the rates of interest to 6 per cent, by wire and otherwise, I asked to be heard before it was done but was made to feel that

my effort to serve was an impertinence, for I did not receive the courtesy of an answer.

I put in the record before the Goldsborough subcommittee on the stabilization bills a copy of the 10 different ways in which the Reserve Board and the reserve banks were contracting credit and currency in the spring of 1929 (pp. 134-135).

Instead of maintaining the currency at the par capita of October, 1920, when it reached \$53 per capita, they steadily contracted it, when it should have been raised after 1921 approximately 4 per cent per annum to correspond with the 4 per cent per annum of annual increase in production.

When the collapse of credit took place, October, 1929, on the stock exchange and the subsequent withdrawal of \$8,000,000,000 of call brokers' loans, the Reserve Board and the reserve banks took no adequate steps to expand credit and currency and to defeat the threatened depression, but contracted credit and currency until forced by public hoarding to expand the reserve notes in 1931 and made the depression worse.

Now that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives by unanimous vote has approved the stabilization bill, the governor of the Federal Reserve Board comes forward and urges that the stabilization of the purchasing power of the dollar be left to him and the Federal Reserve Board and pleads that by expanding credit the evils of the industrial depression can be abated and corrected by the Reserve Board and the reserve banks.

This argument is a confession that they could have corrected the evils of this depression two years and a half ago by doing what they now say they will do as a remedy. Surely, we are justified in asking the governor of the Federal Reserve Board why, if he has this remedy at hand now, he has not availed himself of it for over two years and a half, and why the reserve banks were contracting credit as recently as January, 1932.

The Federal reserve banks and the Federal Reserve Board under 12 years of Republican administration have not only failed to use the great powers given them to stabilize credit and currency and business prosperity, but they have perverted their powers, caused the panic of 1921, and seriously contributed in 1929-1932 to the most devastating panic and depression ever known, causing losses of over \$150,000,000,000 to the American people and a world-wide collapse of business.

The world depression is directly due to American mismanagement. Surely the millions of patriotic Republican citizens who are the innocent victims of unintelligent or unfaithful leadership would not approve such policies if they understood it, and certainly many progressive Republican leaders have deplored or denounced it.

The attempt of the Republican National Committee to put the responsibility of deflation and depression and the terrifying losses which have ensued on the Democratic Party deserves exposure, and I call your attention to the facts for such action as you may deem of value to the country.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. OWEN.

FREEDOM OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] on the Philippines.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON], a former Member of the Insular Affairs Committee:

After only 40 minutes' debate, under a drastic gag rule, a majority of the House of Representatives of the United States on April 4 passed a bill which, if enacted into law by the Senate (over a possible presidential veto), in all likelihood would bring these results:

1. The creation of an independent Philippine nation within eight years.
2. The commercial and perhaps military subjugation of that nation by a great eastern power within a comparatively short period.
3. A bloody rebellion or revolution within the Philippines.
4. The destruction of almost all of the Philippines' marvelous economic progress.
5. The creation of a new disturbing factor in the Far East, vastly increasing the possibilities of war in that sphere.
6. The shrinkage of an important market for the products of the United States, with loss of work for thousands of our people.
7. The weakening of all our relations with the Orient—the most promising field for American commercial expansion in the future.

As this is written it is impossible to say whether the folly embarked upon will be consummated—a folly disastrous alike to the people of the Philippine Islands and the people of the United States. Selfish, short-sighted commercial interests drove the "Philippine independence" bill through the House of Represen-

tatives. Only widespread understanding and knowledge here and in the Philippines as to the destructive character of the proposal for separation will prevent truly tragic results.

To many of our people at this time what may happen in the Philippines seems unimportant because of the very remoteness of the islands. Yet the effect of Philippine separation within the next few years would be less work in our cotton mills, our cigarette factories, our steel mills, and in other industries. We should be taking the first backward step in our friendly and mutually profitable intercourse with the eastern half of the world—the nations whose hundreds of millions of people are potential customers for all the surplus products we can produce, beyond our own needs.

True it is that the Philippines are far away from our shores. But it is far from true that these islands of the east and south are unimportant to us and to the other nations of the world. Yet because of their remoteness it is well to recall to our people some basic facts about the archipelago that came to us as the result of our war with Spain and over which we were given complete sovereignty by purchase and by treaty with that nation.

By that treaty we acquired dominion over approximately 7,100 islands, extending north more than 1,000 miles from a point not far above the equator, in the very shadow, one might say, of the great bulk of Asia. The great port of Hong Kong is only 631 miles from Manila, the capital of the Philippines—and Chinese sailing boats can cover the distance in four and a half days. The Japanese port of Nagasaki is only 1,306 miles from Manila. British Borneo, Dutch Sumatra, French Indo-China, and the Malay Peninsula, with all the islands of the East Indies, are "neighbors" in a geographical sense. Our own nearest mainland port, Seattle, is 5,943 nautical miles from Manila, and San Francisco is 6,221. Yet, despite the proximity of Japan and other oriental nations, the trade of the Philippines with the United States in 1929 (the last world-normal year) amounted to approximately \$211,000,000, compared with a total for all other countries trading with the Philippine Islands of only \$94,000,000.

Here, on these 7,100 islands, with an area of 114,000 square miles, live approximately 13,000,000 people of the Malay, or brown race. The area of the islands is about that of the New England States plus New York State; larger than Belgium, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, and Switzerland combined. About half the islands are forest covered and probably not more than half the arable land is cultivated, although the soil is rich and capable ultimately of supporting a population of 60,000,000. The islands are mountainous and full of mineral wealth—gold, silver, platinum, iron, coal, manganese, and copper.

Certainly the islands are rich enough in natural resources and sparse enough in population to tempt other nations if released by the United States and left unprotected. Less than two days distant by steamer is the most densely populated part of China—a region overcrowded with seething millions, periodically visited by famine and flood, with thousands perishing from starvation. Here is the pressure of overcrowded and vigorous population that well justified Gen. Leonard Wood in saying that under Philippine "independence" the Chinese would soon occupy all the fertile valleys and the Filipinos would be driven to the mountain tops. Nothing seems more certain than that if the Philippines were given so-called "independence" during the next decade, with economic pressure as it is in the Far East, there would be either peaceful or forceful penetration and commercial domination by the Chinese and Japanese, and a loss of the higher standard of living of western civilization. The American population is only about 6,000, and American investments are from \$80,000,000 to \$145,000,000.

To these far eastern islands, after nearly 350 years of Spanish misrule, the United States brought peace, order, and prosperity within a few years of the termination of the Spanish-American War. Schools were established, roads built, banditry suppressed; cholera, smallpox, and other diseases were virtually banished; and a government was instituted which gave the Philippine people, through their elected representatives, the power to make the laws and to maintain their own constabulary. Practically all administrative offices were filled by Filipinos.

At the head of this government is the Governor General, appointed by the President of the United States; yet even the most rabid Filipino politician makes no assertion that there has been cruelty or oppression under this form of government. The fact is that probably never in the history of the world has more rapid progress been made in educating and economically uplifting a large body of nearly primitive people. This is due not only to the application of American ideals but to the character of the people, who were described by Gen. Leonard Wood, when he was governor of the islands, as "property loving, law abiding, sympathetic, intelligent, hospitable, and neighborly," as well as keenly interested in education.

The progress made in a third of a century has resulted in a government that is self-supporting, so that our own expenditure is largely confined to the Army personnel in the Philippines—approximately \$11,500,000 annually. This is an expense that would be part of the National Budget even if this part of our Army were returned to the United States; in other words, the Philippine Islands cost our Government nothing.

Thus we have established in the Far East an outpost of western civilization, with a population that will in time be almost entirely English speaking, due to the necessity of a common language. There is no one native tongue, but as many as 87 languages and dialects. In a total population of about 13,000,000, there are

1,300,000 children in school learning the English language. Probably nine-tenths of the people are Christians, but the minority represent a problem that I shall mention later.

I have recited these facts, about which there can be no controversy, that there may be a clear understanding by all as to what we are dealing with when we legislate on the fate of the islands—and our own fate as a world power.

One other essential fact remains to be stated: Under the Washington conference treaties with other great naval powers, by which armaments were limited, we agreed not to strengthen our defenses in the Philippines. We thereby put a stop to vast competitive expenditures for war purposes in the Far East. We also agreed to maintain the status quo in the Far East, and by giving up the Philippines we would be violating the spirit of the Washington treaties.

Now it remains to consider what happens if the Philippines are given "independence"—in practical effect, set adrift—in 8 or 10 years.

In the first place there probably would be sanguinary conflict in the islands, for one-third of the area is possessed by approximately a million Moros, occupying what is known as the Mahometan territory. These people were never subdued by Spain; they are not likely to be subdued by the Filipinos of the Christian island provinces. They are essentially different. Their faith is that of Islam. Their spoken language descends from the Arabian, with only a small mixture of Malayan words. Their written language shows a mingling of Sanskrit and Indian Arabic. They recognize the Sultan of Sulu and various other native chiefs, or datus, as they are called. There have been bloody conflicts in the past between the Mahometan Moros of the south and the Christian Filipinos in the northern islands. We disarmed the Moros and put weapons in the hands of the Filipino constabulary, so that they are able to exercise a semblance of authority. But take away the restraining hand of the United States, backed by wisdom and consideration in dealing with the proud Moro segment, and what happens when the Philippines attain independence? I think the best answer to that question is contained in this excerpt from a Moro petition submitted to Congress:

"Therefore we, in representation of nearly 500,000 Mahometan residents of Mindanao and Sulu, do solemnly affirm and declare:

"That we are loyal unto death to the United States.

"That in proof of this loyalty we have pledged ourselves, by the most solemn oath known to Mahometans, to die rather than submit to domination by Christian Filipinos from the north, and, if necessary, to die in order that the United States Congress, which heretofore has lent a deaf ear to our petitions, may now hear us."

And much more to the same effect, only in even stronger terms!

Remembering the long struggle of Ireland against England, remembering the hatreds and wars bred in Europe by forced allegiances of racial minorities, remembering the savage, bloody, long-sustained religious wars in the Orient, we may anticipate never-ending rebellion in the Moro Provinces if Philippine independence and sovereignty are now proclaimed. And remembering, too, the vast numbers of Mahometans in the territory adjacent to the Philippines, the conclusion is inescapable that a religious war of wide extent may again be precipitated in the Far East, disastrous to every great nation.

To understand the economic disaster that will be inflicted upon the Filipino people by separation from the United States one must know something of the forces which were aligned to secure passage of the "independence" bill through the House of Representatives.

Openly and covertly advocating separation of the Philippines and the United States were the paid lobbyists of Cuban and American sugar interests, who want to keep Philippine sugar out of this country by tariff barriers when "independence" becomes effective; and the lobbyists of dairy, cottonseed oil, and tobacco interests, who want to bar by import duties Philippine coconut oil (used mainly in making soaps and, to a small degree, margarine substitutes for butter) and Philippine cigars and tobacco.

We produce here only 1 pound of sugar out of every 5 pounds consumed by our people, so that to exclude Philippine sugar would be of the greatest benefit to Cuba.

The intended effect, of course, of limiting our importation of Philippine coconut oil is to increase the market and raise the price for domestically produced cottonseed oil, at the ultimate expense of the consumers of soap, for cottonseed oil will not make soap. The only result will be that the American people will have to pay more.

Now, assuming that these selfish objects are accomplished by the grant of independence and the imposition of tariffs against Philippine products for the benefit of limited classes in this country, what is the general effect?

Easily answered: First, the practical destruction of the means of livelihood of several million people in the Philippine Islands; the ruin of the banking systems of the islands, which have made loans for sugar and coconut oil and copra and tobacco production; and, last, but not least, probably rebellion by native workers who will be reduced to the low economic status of other struggling, suffering populations of the Far East.

These will be the direct effects in the Philippines. But we ourselves shall be punished and penalized, directly and heavily, for our act of hypocrisy in advancing certain special, selfish interests under the guise of liberation of a people already free for all practical intents and purposes.

We shall lose, first of all, the immense latent resources of the Philippines, such as its 486,000,000 board feet of commercial timber, largely rare hardwoods, not produced in the United States, and the islands' capacity for rubber production.

We shall lose a market—the largest we have in the world—for our cotton piece goods; for, of course, an independent Philippine nation would cancel the preferential tariff which now gives us the advantage in selling our cloth, the product of American mills, in the islands. The Philippine cotton goods trade keeps more than 250,000 acres of American farm lands and nearly 6,000 American mill hands busy.

With most of the purchasing power of the Philippines destroyed by an "independence" that will close our doors to the island products, Philippine demand—or ability to pay—for many other American products will terminate. In 1908 our exports to the Philippines amounted to only \$5,000,000. By 1929 they had mounted to \$85,000,000—enough money to keep scores of thousands of American workers busy producing goods for shipment across the Pacific; and the means of support of thousands of dependent women and children. In the 21 years from 1908 to 1929 our exports to the Philippine Islands increased 1,600 per cent, while our purchases from them advanced 1,045 per cent. Meantime, their purchases from foreign countries increased only 130 per cent; so that we had by far the greater share in this market of 12,000,000 people.

Consider the human factor again, in the slump of American exports to the Philippines that would surely follow separation. The millions of dollars' worth of iron and steel goods that we ship to the islands, even in a "low" year, represent the labor of more than 4,500 American workmen. Philippine importers are confident that the withdrawal of free trade would cost American exporters more than three-fourths of their present trade in iron and steel with the islands.

Despite the comparative proximity of the East Indies oil fields, and because of a protective tariff in our favor, we shipped to the Philippines in 1929 nearly 2,000,000 barrels of gasoline, lubricating oil, and similar products. We would lose practically all of this business with separation in effect.

The same year we sent to the Philippines and were paid for 114,340 automobile tires and 1,503,000 pairs of rubber footwear. We sold no fewer than 1,122,000,000 American cigarettes; 6,800 American automobiles, trucks, and busses; 32,000 sewing machines.

Although the Filipinos are a rice-eating people, their consumption of wheat flour has increased nearly fourfold since the establishment of free trade with the United States. Separation of the islands and this Nation politically is largely for the benefit of American sugar interests and cottonseed-oil producers. But with reduced purchasing power the islands will no longer be able to buy most of the flour, the production of which required the cultivation of more than 200,000 acres of wheatland in the United States. The Philippines in a normal year are among the six best markets for United States wheat products. Australia is nearer and its wheat and flour may be expected to capture the market after separation.

The Philippine people under American influence have become milk consumers to a greater degree than any other group of tropical people. Their lands are not suitable for dairy cattle—and so for several years they have been the largest market, on a dollars and cents basis, for condensed and evaporated milk produced in the United States. Philippine imports average a third of the total American exports of canned milks.

I might continue this itemization indefinitely to show the importance of the Philippine market from the standpoint of our workers and their employers. But I have said enough to demonstrate that the separation will bring about disruption and destruction of a trade of more than \$200,000,000 annually (on the basis of 1929 exports and imports), with consequent loss of employment both in the Philippines and in our own country.

The Philippines, of course, are of some value as a naval base for the protection of our commerce with the Far East. But they are of the utmost importance as a commercial base for our peaceful entry with merchandise into the Orient. Too many of our people labor under the misapprehension that the Orient is dormant and means nothing to us. The fact is that the hope of the western world lies in the reawakening of the East, with an increase in the wants and buying power of its hundreds of millions of people.

That awakening can be achieved only by the expansion of trading between east and west. In the Philippines we already have a wonderfully fine commercial gateway to the Orient, with shipping facilities, a transshipment point, banking interests and resources.

Now it is proposed to cast off this outpost of American civilization and base for American trade with half the world—not for the real benefit of the Filipino people but to serve certain special interests in this country. We are choosing the worst possible time, from the standpoint of safety of the Filipino people and the safety of our own interests.

We are preparing to give other nations vitally interested in the Orient something else in the way of territory and resources to quarrel over, to covet, and to become the subject of international intrigue. We disturb naval relations and we lose power to protect our commerce in the East.

Such is the havoc that will be wrought if the "Philippine independence" bill becomes law. We could do no greater injury to the Filipino people than by this means. We do injury to our own people, employed in factory and on farm, if the bill becomes law. And by such legislation we would add one more point of disturbance and possible strife to a world that is trying to find the way to a lasting peace. No greater folly has been proposed since this country reached its majority in the family of nations.

SENATE BILL RETURNED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 51. An act to authorize the building up of the United States Navy to the strength permitted by the Washington and London naval treaties; to the Committee on Naval Appropriations.

DEATH OF THE PRESIDENT OF FRANCE

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, during my visit to France last year it was my great privilege and honor to meet in conference the President of the French Republic, M. Paul Doumer, at his summer palace on the outskirts of Paris. A more affable, able, and delightful gentleman I have never met in my life. He was beloved by the nation and made a wonderful President. The news that he had met an assassin's bullet in Paris on Friday last came to us as a great shock, and it was a great sorrow to subsequently learn that this distinguished and able gentleman, 78 years of age, had passed away.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 218

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States of America has learned with profound sorrow of the death of the President of the French Republic, M. Paul Doumer, and sympathizes with the people of the French Republic in the loss of their beloved President.

Resolved, That the President be requested to communicate this expression of sentiment of the House of Representatives to the Government of France.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of President Doumer the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 10, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Tuesday, May 10, 1932, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(11 a. m.)

Hearing: Ambassador Joseph C. Grew, ambassador to Turkey.

PATENTS

(10.30 a. m.)

Hearings on general revision of the design copyright law.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

(10.30 a. m.)

Hearings on New York, Virginia, Wisconsin, and Alabama projects.

MERCHANT MARINE, RADIO, AND FISHERIES

(10 a. m.)

Hearings on H. R. 10329, relating to application of the coastwise laws to the Virgin Islands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. DAVIS: Committee on Merchant Marine, Radio, and Fisheries. H. R. 10674. A bill to amend section 14 of the shipping act, 1916, as amended by section 20 of the merchant marine act, 1920; with amendment (Rept. No. 1265). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 11966) to amend section 14 of an act entitled "An act to adjust water-right charges, to grant certain other relief on the Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 636), as amended (46 Stat. 249); to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 11967) to reform the procedure of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia where charges are preferred of professional misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California: A bill (H. R. 11968) to provide that the prevailing rate of wages shall be paid to laborers and mechanics employed in the construction of Federal-aid highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 11969) to provide for the construction of a suitable approach to the Arlington Memorial Bridge connecting Lee Boulevard (route No. 711 of Virginia) with the Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 11970) providing for the control, regulation, and development of certain areas of the public domain in the State of Idaho, and for the creation of a livestock grazing reserve therein; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 11971) to fulfill certain treaty obligations with respect to water levels of the Lake of the Woods; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAYBURN: Resolution (H. Res. 217) for the consideration of H. R. 11677, a bill to amend sections 5, 15a, and 19a of the interstate commerce act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Resolution (H. Res. 218) relative to the death of M. Paul Doumer, late President of the French Republic; to the Committee of the Whole House.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HESS: A bill (H. R. 11972) granting an increase of pension to Maggie Burke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11973) granting a pension to Kate Rudicill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOGG of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 11974) granting an increase of pension to Lois O. Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 11975) granting an increase of pension to Augusta L. Cozier; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11976) granting an increase of pension to Carrie A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KURTZ: A bill (H. R. 11977) granting a pension to Angeline Roudabush; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANLOVE: A bill (H. R. 11978) granting a pension to Ida C. Cantrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 11979) for the relief of George R. Sharp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. OWEN: A bill (H. R. 11980) authorizing the President of the United States to make a posthumous award of a distinguished flying cross to Glenn H. Curtiss, deceased, and to present the same to Lua Curtiss, mother of the said Glenn H. Curtiss, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 11981) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson Tabor Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUDD: A bill (H. R. 11982) for the relief of George Migliorino; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 11983) granting a pension to Jack Carlton Hood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 11984) granting an increase of pension to Flora V. Smart; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMASON: A bill (H. R. 11985) for the relief of Sarah A. Morris; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TIERNEY: A bill (H. R. 11986) granting a pension to Emma Hodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7611. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Niagara County Board of Supervisors, opposing reduction of the United States Naval Reserve unit now stationed at Niagara Falls; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

7612. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of Michigan State Senate, indorsing House bill 11298, providing for the designation of the city of Detroit as a port of entry for antiques; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7613. By Mr. CORNING: Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, protesting against the proposed removal of customs facilities from the city of Albany; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7614. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the New York Florists' Club, favoring the modification or repeal of the Volstead Act, as this, in their opinion, will be of benefit, not only to the florist profession but to the entire country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7615. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Rubbercraft Corporation of Los Angeles, Calif., opposing tax on crude rubber coming into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7616. Also, petition of many citizens of Los Angeles County, Calif., demanding appropriate steps toward the upholding of honor of American womanhood in Hawaii; to the Committee on the Territories.

7617. Also, petition of the Los Angeles Building Trades Council, Los Angeles, Calif., opposing any measure that would deprive the United States Department of Labor of full jurisdiction over Federal employment service or destroy the United States Employment Service's interstate aspect; to the Committee on Labor.

7618. Also, petition of Western Auto Supply Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., opposing tax on crude rubber coming into the United States and on automobile accessories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7619. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of the directors of the Eastern Intercollegiate Association, representing the athletic interests of the colleges of the New England and Middle Atlantic States, seriously protesting against the imposition of a tax of 10 per cent on admission to intercollegiate athletic games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7620. By Mr. HOLLISTER: Resolution adopted by the American Supply & Machinery Manufacturers' Association, the National Supply & Machinery Distributors' Association, and the Southern Supply & Machinery Distributors' Association in triple joint convention at the Netherlands Plaza Hotel in Cincinnati, Ohio, on May 4, 1932, favoring an emergency industries' preservation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7621. By Mr. JAMES: Telegram from C. Ron Daman, president of student organization, Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton, Mich., protesting against the elimination from the War Department appropriation bill the provision abolishing Reserve Officers' Training Corps camps and citizens' military training camps and the reduction of 2,000 Regular Army officers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7622. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of residents of Barnesboro, Pa., urging enactment of the Davis-Kelly coal stabilization bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7623. Also, petition of residents of Lilly and Cresson, Pa., urging enactment of the Davis-Kelly coal stabilization bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7624. Also, petition of residents of Charleroi, Pa., urging enactment of the Davis-Kelly coal stabilization bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7625. Also, petition of residents of Brockway, Pa., urging the enactment of the Davis-Kelly coal stabilization bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7626. Also, petition of residents of Rimersberg, Pa., urging the enactment of the Davis-Kelly coal stabilization bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7627. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 179 residents of Douglas County, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7628. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., indorsing the Frazier bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7629. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., favoring enactment of an inheritance tax and a gift tax, and a substantial increase in Federal tax laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7630. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., favoring enactment of the principles of the Wheeler bill, for the purpose of stabilizing the value of money; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7631. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., favoring enactment of the principles of the McNary-Haugen plan, or the Swank-Thomas plan; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7632. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., asking for instructions to American delegation at Geneva, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7633. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., favoring employment on public improvements for unemployed labor, and further favoring payment for such labor and necessary materials with non-interest-bearing bonds, etc.; to the Committee on Labor.

7634. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., opposing Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, and demanding that industrial schedules be reduced to the schedule of the Fordney-McCumber Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7635. Also, petition of Farmers' Union locals of Hector, Palmyra, Brookfield, Melville, Osceola, and Martinsburg Townships, Renville County, Minn., urging closest economy consistent with good government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

7636. Also, petition of Willmar (Minn.) Lodge, No. 340, Brotherhood Railway Clerks, opposing House bill 11152, regarding pick-up service for parcel post in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7637. Also, petition of 16 residents of Terrace, Minn., opposing enactment of any blue laws at this time; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

7638. Also, petition of Hibbing Post, No. 1221, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hibbing, Minn., urging immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7639. Also, petition of Duluth Lodge of B. F. L. and E., Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7640. Also, petition of Commercial Club, Granite Falls, Minn., urging enactment of Senate bill 1197; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7641. Also, petition of Post No. 308, American Legion, Franklin, Minn., protesting against any change in the World War veterans act; to the Committee on Economy.

7642. Also, petition of Granite Falls Post, No. 69, American Legion, Granite Falls, Minn., protesting against any change

in the World War veterans' act; to the Committee on Economy.

7643. Also, petition of Association of Commerce, St. Paul, Minn., opposing the transfer of jurisdiction over river and harbor improvements from the Corps of Army Engineers to the proposed department of public works; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

7644. Also, petition of Association of Manufacturers' Representatives, Minneapolis, Minn., urging reductions in public expenditures; to the Committee on Economy.

7645. Also, petition of Association of Manufacturers' Representatives, Minneapolis, Minn., opposing payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7646. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Resolution adopted by the Topeka Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Topeka, Kans., signed by the president, Anna B. Fisher, and the secretary, Marion Wiede, urging support of the prohibition law and its enforcement and against modification, resubmission, or repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7647. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the American Banker, opposing the Glass Banking Act of 1932; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7648. Also, petition of the New York Florists' Club, New York City, favoring the modification of the Volstead Act and also its repeal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7649. Also, petition of United States Building and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., favoring the home land bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7650. Also, petition of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio, favoring the balancing of the Budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7651. Also, petition of Eastern Association for Selection of Football Officials, Bethlehem, Pa., protesting against the 10 per cent tax on admissions to intercollegiate athletic games; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7652. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of Wellesley College Christian Association, Wellesley, Mass., relating to the reduction of War Department expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7653. By Mr. NOLAN: Petition from various organizations in Minneapolis, favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7654. Also, petition of organizations in Minneapolis, favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7655. By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Polish-American Citizens Club, of Manchester, N. H., signed by Frank Bialon, W. L. Bigos, and W. S. Kijez, memorializing Congress to enact House Joint Resolution 144, General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7656. Also, resolution by the mayor and board of aldermen of Manchester, N. H., signed by Mayor Damase Caron, regarding the curtailment of Federal expenditures and a decrease in taxation; to the Committee on Economy.

7657. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of C. B. Axford, editor American Banker, opposing the Glass banking legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7658. Also, petition of the New York Florists' Club, New York City, favoring the modification or repeal of the Volstead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7659. Also, petition of United States Building and Loan League, Chicago, Ill., favoring the passage of the home-loan bank legislation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

7660. Also, petition of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio, favoring the balancing of the Budget; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7661. By Mr. SNOW: Petition of William E. Fish, jr., and many other citizens of Bangor, Me., favoring passage of House bill 9891; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7662. Also, petition of George T. McCarthy and many other citizens of Bangor, Me., favoring passage of House

bill 9891; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7663. By Mr. TIERNEY: Petition protesting against reduction of benefits to disabled veterans; to the Committee on Pensions.

7664. By Mr. WEST: Petition of 210 members of the Ohio Railroad Employees and Citizens League, protesting against the unjust, unreasonable, and discriminatory operation of inadequately regulated and taxed busses and trucks engaged in transportation, the subsidizing with public funds of water and other forms of transportation competitive with railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7665. Also, resolution of the Licking County Rural Letter Carriers' Association, protesting against Senate bill 2490; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 10, 1932

(Legislative day of Monday, May 9, 1932)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2775. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1869, as amended; and

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to close upper Water Street between Twenty-second and Twenty-third Streets.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) providing for the correction of an error in the enrollment of Senate bill 3584, relating to insurance corporations in the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7305. An act to permit construction, maintenance, and use of certain pipe lines for petroleum and petroleum products; and

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to authorize the merger of street-railway corporations operating in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MINERAL RESOURCES AS RELATED TO FARM LANDS (S. DOC. NO. 93)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, submitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 377, of the Seventy-first Congress, a report pertaining to the mineral resources of the country as related to farm lands, prepared in the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the department, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed with an illustration.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Children's Bureau, which are not needed in the conduct of business and possess no historical interest, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. METCALF and Mr. COPELAND members of the committee on the part of the Senate.